DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 274 157 FL 015 991

AUTHOR Kubrusly, M. Helena
TITLE Does the Teacher Make a Difference? A Study on the Correlation between Learners' Perceptions of Their Teachers and Their Reactions to the Topics Covered during the Course.
PUB DATE Sep 84
NOTE 94p.; M.A. Thesis, University of Lancaster. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language (20th, Brighton, England, April 1-4, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; *Course Content; Foreign Countries; Research Methodology; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Student Relationship

ABSTRACT

A study of the relationship of the student-teacher interaction and student reactions to course content found that the student perceptions of the enjoyment, difficulty, and usefulness of the different course components were positively correlated with their perceptions of the different tutors teaching those components. The students' reactions to course content were measured on a pre- and post-course questionnaire, and their perceptions of the teachers were measured with a repertory grid technique eliciting comparisons of constructs as they related to the three teachers and six other students. The use of this research method was not found to present any new problems. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED274157

DOES THE TEACHER MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

A STUDY ON THE CORRELATION BETWEEN LEARNERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR TEACHERS AND THEIR REACTIONS TO THE TOPICS COVERED DURING THE COURSE

DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
M.A. IN LINGUISTICS FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Maria-Helena Kubrusly

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF LANCASTER

SUPERVISOR: R.L.ALLWRIGHT

M.HELENA KUBRUSLY

SEPTEMBER 1984

FL 015 991

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

This study attempts to correlate learners' perceptions of their teachers to their perception of the subject matter covered by these teachers. The data for this study were collected at a teacher training course.

Learners' perceptions of the course were measured by means of a "pre" and "post-course" questionnaire. Their perception of teachers were outlined using the Repertory Grid Technique. The background to the technique, how to elicit a grid plus a description of the method of analysis used are considered.

Some issues concerning the teacher/learner interaction are identified based on the analyses of the data.

Suggestions are made for further research which could be undertaken using the Repertory Grid Technique.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to thank my supervisor Dick Allwright for his help and encouragement; the staff and trainees of the International Teacher Training Institute at International House, London, for their help with the collection of the data; Dr. Thomas and Dr. Harri Augstein from the Centre for the Study of Human Learning, Brunel University, for discussing with me techniques which have been applied to this study; and Luzia de Castro for her neat and meticulous typing of the manuscript.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION	1
1.0 Introduction and Statement of Aims	1
2.0 Why Look into Tutors/Trainees Relationship	1
2.1 Introduction	1
2.2 Brief Review of the Literature	2
2.3 Research Question I	4
3.0 How to Look into Trainees/Tutors Relationship	4
3.1 Brief Review of Research Methods	4
3.2 The Repertory Grid Technique - Background to the Technique	6
3.3 Research Question II	8
CHAPTER II - THE SETTING AND THE SUBJECTS OF THIS STUDY	9
1.0 Introduction	9
2.0 The Setting	9
2.1 The Institution	9
2.2 The Course	9
2.2.1 Background to the Course	9
2.2.2 The Course in Question	10
3.0 The Subjects	10
3.1 Participants in an RSA Preparatory Certificate Course	10
3.2 The Subjects of this Study	10
CHAPTER III - DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES	12
1.0 Introduction	12
2.0 Trainees' Perceptions of the Course	12

Page

2.1 The Questionnaires Design 12

2.2 Implementation of the Questionnaires 13

3.0 Trainees' Perceptions of their Tutors 14

3.1 The Repertory Grid Technique - How to Elicit a Grid 14

3.2 The Repertory Grid Technique - Applied to this Study 16

3.2.1 The Pilot Study 17

3.2.2 The Collection of the Data Itself 18

4.0 Summary 19

CHAPTER IV - ANALYSIS OF THE DATA AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS 20

1.0 Introduction 20

2.0 The Questionnaires 20

2.1 Analysis of the Questionnaires 20

2.2 The Findings of the Questionnaires 22

2.2.1 For the Whole Group 22

2.2.2 For Individual Informants 26

3.0 The Grids 26

3.1 Introduction - How to Measure the Results of a Grid 26

3.2 The Analysis of the Grids in this Study 27

3.2.1 Grouping the Constructs 28

3.2.2 Constructs where one of the Tutors was Differentiated 29

3.2.3 The Allocation of the Tutor in Relation to the Pole of the Construct 30

3.3 The Findings of the Grid 30

3.3.1 For the Whole Group 30

3.3.2 For Individual Informants 32

4.0 Putting the Results Together - Some Hypotheses that might Account for the Data 34

Page

4.1 Introduction 34

4.2 For the Whole Group 34

4.3 For Individual Informants 34

CHAPTER V - CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

1.0 Introduction 38

2.0 Summary of the Analyses and Consequent Implications 38

2.1 Summary of the Analyses 38

2.2 Implications 39

3.0 Methodological Conclusions 41

3.1 The Questionnaires 41

3.1.1 Methodological Problems 41

3.1.2 Implications for Further Research 41

3.2 The Repertory Grid Technique 42

3.2.1 Methodological Problems 42

3.2.2 Implications and Suggestions for Further Research 42

NOTES 45

BIBLIOGRAPHY 48

APPENDIX 1 - Background to the Study - The RSA Preparatory Certificate Course 1

- Table A - Details about the Subjects of the Study 4

APPENDIX 2 - Data Collection

- "Pre and Post-Course" Questionnaires 1

- The Repertory Grid Sheet 4

Page

APPENDIX 3 - Perceptions of the Course for Individual Informants

- Table 1 "Enjoyment" 1
- Table 2 "Difficulty" 2
- Table 3 "Usefulness" 3

APPENDIX 4 - Perceptions of the Teachers

- A Completed Grid 1
- Table 4A - List of Constructs under Superordinate Categories 2
- Table 5 - Tutors' Allotment to Construct Poles 3

APPENDIX 5 - Subjects' Profiles

- Subject 002 1
- Subject 003 2
- Subject 004 3
- Subject 008 4
- Subject 010 5
- Subject 011 6
- Subject 012 7
- Subject 016 8
- Subject 018 9

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction and Statement of Aims

The aim of this study is to investigate the extent to which learners' reactions to a course are related to their perceptions of the course teachers.

The data were obtained through questionnaires (reactions to a course) and the repertory grid technique (perceptions of the course teachers).

The repertory grid technique was chosen because it was considered to be the most adequate research tool to attempt to measure learners' perceptions of their teachers. The potential of the repertory grid technique with a view to its application to investigate other issues in this field was considered.

The first section of this study gives a brief review of the literature with regard to the importance of the teacher/learner interaction. Then the repertory grid technique as a research tool and its application to education is considered. The application of the technique to this study and the method of data collection is then outlined, followed by a description of the analyses of the data. Finally, the issues identified, the conclusions reached and the pedagogical and methodological implications are discussed.

2.0 Why Look into Tutors/Trainees Relationship

2.1 Introduction

There has been a change of focus in classroom research over the past decade. The same is true for research in education. The

study of such factors as attitudes, social adjustment, friendship choices and perceptions of learners and teachers has increased. Earlier studies concentrated on such aspects as IQ and social class related to performance. (cf. Pope & Keen, 1981:19).

As for classroom research, Allwright (1983) describes how method was the focus of research in the sixties. However "the major experiments conducted in the sixties to decide which method was to be advocated proved inconclusive at best, if not simply invalid." (cf. Allwright, 1983:195). As a result there was a retreat from 'prescription' to 'description' and from 'technique' to 'process' which led to "the emergence of two viewpoints on classroom - centred research: one focusing on the interactive aspect of classroom behavior, and the other focusing more on the teacher's talk as input." (ibid.: 199).

This study considers one of the many factors involved in the interactive aspect of classroom behavior, i.e., the teacher/learner relationship.*

2.2 Brief Review of the Literature

The importance of the affective domain in the learning process has been emphasized by many authors in the recent past.

This has been so in the area of education[1] as a whole and more recently in the area of language teaching in particular. In the latter, the so-called"humanistic approaches"are probably the ones which reflect this tendency the most. Stevick reviewes most of these approaches in

---

* Data for this study were collected at a teacher training course and this study will be dealing with tutor (teacher)/trainee (learner) relationship which means that the learners involved in this study are also teachers.

1 The numbers in the text refer to notes at the end. Please see pge 45.

his work. He suggests that the thinking and practice of some non-language teachers like Curran and Gattegno "draw our attention beneath the surface structure of what we do, and deepen our understanding of why we do it and how it works." (cf. Stevick, 1973:259).

In his review of Curran's work (Curran, 1972) Stevick mentions "the student who not only thinks but also feels, and whose ability to perform cognitively is promoted or limited by his emotional freedom or lack thereof." (ibid.:260). He goes on to describe in detail five different experiments where it became evident that the way the teacher related to the learner(s) was crucial for the learning process (ibid: 266-9).

Stevick (1976:110) also calls our attention to the "terribly important difference between learning that is defensive, and learning that is receptive."[2] He suggests that "we need to bring to our work an understanding of the ego-defenses which both student and instructor use" and then he adds that "learning will be slowed down when the learner is busy defending himself from someone else" (ibid.:120). Thus the way the learner reacts to the teacher will be crucial in the learning process.

It is a common experience to find a correlation between enjoyment of a subject and the relationship with the teacher of this subject. This is particularly true of young learners when the identification of the subject with the teacher is greater.

According to Curran (1972:24)

> In the early phases of learning it is the intensity of the relationship with the teacher - on the model of the early parent-child relationship - that seems to be crucial. Often in the later phases of learning, interest in and enthusiasm for particular subjects, and even the final choice of a life vocation, can be directly traced to such early, deeply personal engagements. Only in the later

phases of learning does the subject matter itself carry its own meaning and purpose.

All the factors mentioned above led to the research question - are learners (trainees) reactions to a course related to their reactions to the teacher (tutor)?

2.3 Research Question I

This study attempts to correlate trainees' perceptions of the topic/area taught with those of the tutors responsible for these topics/areas.

Mature learners were preferred to young ones as they are more prone to making a distinction between the subject taught and the teacher who covered it, as mentioned above.

3.0 How to Look into Trainees/Tutors Relationship

3.1 Brief Review of Research Methods

Cohen and Manion (1980) provide a thorough account of the research methods in use in education. Most of these have actually been used in classroom research.

According to Allwright (1983), classroom research methods can be basically devided into observation and introspection. Observation consists of keeping a record of what goes on in the classroom. Introspection collects information from the participants in the classroom interaction. This can be done through questionnaires, interviews or diary studies (cf. Allwright, 1983:192-3). In the past few years, research based on mentalistic data has been developed. These include the diary studies mentioned above and also "think aloud technique", "immediate retrospection" and "delayed retrospection" (cf. Cohen & Hosenfeld, 1981).

It was considered that for the aims of this study, i.e., dealing with reactions, data should be collected through introspection as this was considered to be more accurate than the researcher's interpretation of the subjects' reactions through observation (e.g. how trainees reacted to their tutors).

There were basically two issues at hand: trainees' reactions to a course and reactions to the course tutors. Due to their different nature it seemed that these two issues had to be tackled with different research techniques.

The trainees' reactions to the course were measured through a "before and an after" course questionnaire [3].

However the trainees' reaction to their tutors was a much more delicate matter to be dealt with. Any research method which would overt ly expose the trainee to expressing his/her reactions to the tutors was felt to be too crude. A further consideration to be taken into account was the danger of inadvertedly imposing the researcher's own view of a "tutor" on the subjects through the research instrument. Questionnaires or interviews, by their very nature, did not seem appropriate since the mere choice of words could lead (or mislead!) the trainees in one direction. As Nash (1973:21) suggests "if we want to know what attitudes a person holds we should make it our task to discover what these actually <u>are</u>, rather than, as is conventionally done, ask him to agree or disagree with a list of statements somehow held to form a 'scale'".

With mentalistic research techniques, explaining to the subjects what they were supposed to write/talk about might have suggested to them one or another direction to follow. On top of that it was considered that their reactions should be measured only once and not over a span

of time.

Any research tool which would put into words what we were looking for was considered inadequate. A more indirect and subtle approach seemed more appropriate.

A thorough search of the methods presently in use in educational research suggested that Kelly's (1955) Repertory Grid Technique would be the most adequate for this study.

For Kelly "the distinction usually made between cognition and affect was inappropriate" (cf. Pope & Keen, 1981:28) and a research tool which would take both into account seemed most appropriate to look into trainees' perceptions of their tutors.

3.2 The Repertory Grid Technique[4] - Background to the Technique

The repertory grid technique evolved from Kelly's theory of personal constructs (1955).

According to Kelly (1955 [1963]:9) "man looks at his world through transparent patterns or templets which he creates and then attempts to fit over the realities of which the world is composed." Kelly called these "patterns", constructs - "ways of construing the world." (ibid.:9).

A construct is "essentially a discrimination which a person can make" about elements of the world. (cf. Bannister & Fransella, 1971 [1980]:38). Another central notion in Kelly's theory is that of the bipolarity of the constructs. "Kelly's argument is that we make sense out of our world by simultaneously noting likenesses and differences." (cf. Fransella & Bannister, 1977:5). Kelly suggests that each person has a particular construct system. He devised the repertory grid technique as a "method for exploring personal construct systems. It

is an attempt to stand in others' shoes, to see their world as they see it, to understand their situation, their concerns" (ibid.:5) Kelly himself described the repertory grid technique as a method for "going beyond words" (quoted in Fransella & Bannister, 1977:V).

The repertory grid technique was first used to investigate people's construct of other people. In this case "the elements of the world" about whom the subject would be construing would be other people. These are actually called the elements of the grid.

Kelly originally devised the role construct repertory test which he used to investigate relationships between his patients and their families, friends, etc. The repertory grid technique as we know it today, which evolved from that, however "is not a test but a methodology involving highly flexible techniques and variable application" (cf. Pope & Keen, 1981:36). In fact the repertory grid technique developed beyond Kelly's own approach as not only people have been used as elements of grids but also innanimate objects and abstract ideas.

Bannister and Mair (1968) and Fransella & Bannister (1977) summarize the different forms of the grid in use today and its various applications.

Personal construct psychology is now a well established, creditable and powerful branch of modern psychology.

The fact that the repertory grid technique has been in use in education for some time is of particular interest. Pope & Keen (1981) provide a thorough account of the different uses of the grid in education up to that date[5] (cf. Pope & Keen, 1981:136-148).

It is of particular interest for the aims of this study the

fact that Nash (1973) elicited teachers' perceptions of their learners, i.e., how they typified their learners and vice-versa; i.e., how learners typified their teachers (cf. Nash, 1976a) using the repertory grid technique.

The fact that in our field, i.e., language teaching the repertory grid technique has not been widely used[6] posed a further question.

3.3 Research Question II

Would the repertory grid technique be adequate to pursue the issue at hand for this study, i.e., outline trainees' perceptions of their tutors?

This presented the opportunity to become familiar with the grid and at the same time gain some insight into the possibility of using it to investigate other issues in our field.

4.0 Summary

Two distinct research questions emerged:

1 - Are trainees' reactions to topic/area taught related to their reactions to the course tutors?

2 - Is the repertory grid technique suitable for looking into this matter and can it be used to investigate any other issues in the field of language teaching?

CHAPTER II

THE SETTING AND THE SUBJECTS OF THIS STUDY

1.0 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to give an account of the setting for the research and of the subjects involved in it. This will be done in terms of a description of the teacher training course where the data were collected and of the trainees who attended that course.

2.0 The Setting

2.1 The Institution

Data for this study were collected at the International Teacher Training Institute at International House (IH), London.

2.2 The Course

2.2.1 Background to the Course

The teacher training course where data were collected is the RSA Preparatory Certificate[7]. The course is designed to lead the participants to the acquisition of the Royal Society of Arts Preparatory Certificate for the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language to adults (RSA Prep. Cert.). The course is a pre-service scheme although sometimes participants are practising teachers with little or no training in the field. It is an intensive four week course (20 days) with one hundred contact hours. The course consists of morning sessions of three hours devoted to 'input' in various forms, and afternoon sessions of two hours devoted to teaching practice. During these teaching practice sessions trainees will take turns in teaching foreign adult learners. When not teaching, trainees will observe their

peers from the back of the classroom.

There is one tutor in charge of the course, the course tutor, and two teaching practice tutors.

2.2.2 The Course in Question

The course tutor will be referred to as A in this study, and the two teaching practice tutors as B and C respectively. In this particular course tutor A was responsible for the first two hours of the morning sessions whereas tutors B and C shared the third hour. For the afternoon sessions the group was split into three sub-groups. Each tutor was assigned to one group. Tutors then rotated so that each sub-group worked with each tutor for 6-7 days.

3.0 The Subjects

3.1 Participants in an RSA Preparatory Certificate Course

As mentioned before participants have little or no previous teaching experience. All the prospective participants are interviewed by an experienced tutor before admission to the course. The majority of them take the course to improve their job prospects.

It is worth mentioning that a large number of private language schools in this country consider the RSA Prep. Cert. as an essential qualification for their teachers. Trainees pay a fee for attendance.

3.2 The Subjects of this Study

A group of eighteen trainees attended this particular teacher training course. They were all native speakers of English: 1 American, 2 Australians and the remaining 15 British. Most of them are in their

twenties with only 3 exceptions. Five of the trainees had already had formal teacher training. Nine of them had had some EFL and/or ESL experience mostly with private tuition abroad. Only five out of these nine are actualy EFL/ESL teachers abroad at present.

Table A in Appendix 1 p.4 gives details about each subject's formal teacher training, EFL/ESL experience, experience in teaching other languages and present occupation. For reasons of confidentiality subjects have been assigned numbers (001 to 018). For each subject their sex (M = Male; F = Female) age and nationality is also provided in the table.

CHAPTER III

DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

1.0 Introduction

In this chapter the research methodology will be outlined. As mentioned before the two different issues for this study were approached with two different research techniques.

In the first part of this chapter, a description of the research instrument used to measure the trainees' reactions to the course, i.e., questionnaires, will be provided as well as an account of its implementation.

The second half of the chapter will be devoted to describing how to elicit a repertory grid and how the technique was used in the present study for outlining trainees' perceptions of their tutors.

2.0 Trainees' Perceptions of the Course

Trainees' perceptions of the course have been measured by means of a "pre and a post-course" questionnaire .

2.1 The Questionnaire Design

An identical questionnaire for the pre-course and the post-course evaluation was used so that the results could be compared.

In the pre-course questionnaire trainees were asked to score their expectations with regard to enjoyment, difficulty and usefulness for each particular topic to be covered during the course. In the post-course questionnaire they were asked to score their reactions to the course in the same way. The questionnaires consisted of a list of the topics covered during the course on the left hand side of the paper

followed by three columns ("enjoyment", "difficulty", "usefulness") where the trainees were supposed to score their expectations/reactions to the course.

Trainees were asked to score their expectations and reactions out of a seven point scale as follows:

+ + +	very high
+ +	
+	
0	
-	
- -	
- - -	very low

An actual copy of each questionnaire is provided in Appendix 2.

2.2 Implementation of the Questionnaires

Trainees completed the pre-course questionnaire during the first morning of the course. It took them 15-20 minutes to complete them, as expected. The pre-course questionnaire consisted of two pages - on the first page a succint explanation of the questionnaire was provided whereas the questionnaire itself was on the second page. To ensure confidentiality trainees were only asked to identify themselves on the first page of this questionnaire. They were subsequently assigned numbers which were copied on to the questionnaire itself.

The post-course questionnaire was administered on the last day of the course. The first page of the pre-course questionnaire, i.e., the one with trainees' names and numbers on was returned to them on this occasion and they were asked to only use their identification numbers from then on.

Note: trainees completed the grids just before answering the post-

course questionnaires. They were then already using their identification numbers.

3.0 Trainees' Perceptions of their Tutors

These have been outlined with the repertory grid technique. The theoretical background to the technique was considered in chapter I (cf. pages 6-8).In this chapter the use of the technique is described.

3.1 The Repertory Grid Technique - How to Elicit a Grid*

When a researcher decides to use the repertory grid to collect data s/he is confronted with problems that concern "the nature of the elements to be used, forms of construct elicitation and the format (e.g. ranking, rating or bipolar allotment) in which the subject is to respond." (cf. Fransella & Bannister, 1977:9). Not to mention the problems with the choice of the method of analysis later on.

In this study Kelly's original dichotomous form of the grid was used (cf. Pope & keen 1981:45). In this case subjects allot the elements to one or the other pole of the constructs[8]. The elements and/or the constructs of a grid can be either given or elicited. Appropriacy will depend on the initial purpose of the grid and mode of elicitation (cf. Pope, Keen 1981:40). For this study it was thought that the elements should be given and the constructs elicited. Therefore the process of elicitation described here will be of eliciting constructs, given the elements.

The repertory grid technique was originally devised to be used with one individual at a time. However it has been used with groups

---

* Only the form of the grid used in this study will be described here. For other varieties of the grid see especially Fransella & Bannister (1977).

as it was in the case of this study. There are limitations to the technique when it is used with a group. When dealing with one person the researcher usually discusses the construct with the person in order to clarify its meaning. (cf. Thomas, 1976). In the case of eliciting a grid from a group this can not be done, i.e., it is not possible for the researcher to talk to each individual to clarify the meaning of the constructs. This has consequences for the analyses of the grids and will be discussed in detail in the next chapter (cf. page 28).

To elicit a grid the subjects are given the repertory grid sheet[9] (see Appendix 2 page 4). And as many numbered cards as the elements on the grid sheet.

The columns in the repertory grid sheet represent the elements of the grid, i.e., the people, objects or ideas about whom the subject is going to construe. In this case there are nine elements (E1 to E9) but these can be as many as eighteen. The constructs define the lines on the sheet - in this case there are six C1 to C6.

The cards are a means of identification of the elements therefore subjects are asked to write the elements they are going to construe about on the cards (e.g. names of people).

The subjects are then given three elements (e.g. E1, E2, E3) and asked to pair two of them (these are referred to as pair) and single the third one out (this is referred to as singleton).

The next step is to ask the subject to define the aspect which makes the two elements most alike. The person writes down this aspects on the left hand side of the paper under C1 and its opposite on the right hand side of the paper on the same line. These (the aspect and its opposite) define the two poles of the construct (C1

in this case). The importance of the bipolarity of the constructs has already been mentioned (cf. page 6). Kelly (1955 [1963]:61) suggests that "in its minimum context a construct is a way in which at least two elements are similar and contrast with a third".

When the two poles of the construct are defined the subject is asked to allot each element to one pole of the construct. All the elements the person is construing are considered for this stage since "a construct is a dimension which may evolve when considering a particular set of elements but can usually be applied to a further range of elements" (cf. Pope & Keen (1981:36).

When the procedure outlined above is finished the subject is given another set of 3 elements and another construct is elicited in the same way "For Kelly constructs do not exist in isolation". It is his view that "constructs are linked with each other in a more or less coherent and hierarchical manner." (cf. Pope, Keen 1981:36). Thus the need to elicit more than one construct about the same elements.

3.2 The Repertory Grid Technique Applied to this Study

As mentioned above, for this study the elements of the grid were given and the constructs elicited. The elements consisted of nine people involved in the course - nine was the number of elements considered to be the minimum necessary for eliciting a grid. As there were only three tutors involved in the course trainees were asked to use six of their colleagues (whoever they wanted to) as the other elements of the grid.*

The constructs were then elicited taking into account all the nine elements of the grid. This distribution of elements in the grid,

---

* I should like to thank Dr. Harri Augstein for this suggestion.

i.e., three tutors and six trainees has further consequences for the analysis of the grids (cf. pages 29-30).

3.2.1 The Pilot Study[10]

A pilot study was designed to give the researcher some practice with the technique before attempting to use it with a group.

A total of 10 subjects completed grids for this purpose. As it happened most of them did it individually and only in one instance a group of three did it together.

As all the people who completed the grids were attending the same course the distribution of elements between tutors (teachers) and trainees (learners) which had been envisaged for the actual collection of the data was maintained, i.e., three teachers and six learners. The subjects were given the grid sheet and the cards numbered from 1 to 9 with three of their tutors' names already written on cards 1, 4 and 7. This strategy was devised so that the first construct, i.e., the most likely to raise questions or problems, did not contain the names of the tutors. (At this stage it had been assumed that the first construct would be elicited about elements 1, 2 and 3).

The subjects were then given the following triads, one at a time, to elicit constructs: 1,2,3; 4,5,6; 7,8,9; 1,4,7; 2,5,8 and 3,6,9.

However 2 of the subjects when confronted with the triad, 1,4,7, noticed that s/he had 3 of her/his tutors in hand. Therefore this proved not to be an adequate tactic. Also the fact that they received the cards with the names already on them was not satisfactory as they were confronted with two different styles of handwriting and the tutors were the odd ones out. So for the actual collection of data a different strategy was adopted as described below.

The other insight that came out of the pilot study was with regard to how to address any points raised by the subjects during the elicitation. The results from the pilot study suggested that one had to be as succint as possible not to give any hints which might be interpreted (or misinterpreted) as to what was expected from the subjects.

As Pope & Keen suggest "the art of conversational elicitation of elements and constructs is to help the participant to focus his attention on these aspects of his thoughts and feelings which are relevant to the purpose, without putting ideas or feelings into the participant's mouth." (cf. Pope & Keen, 1981:38).

3.2.2. The Collection of Data Itself

The grid was elicited on the morning of the last day of the course. Before completing the grid the informants were assured of the confidentiality of the work once more.

The group was told that the aim of this study was to look into the teaching/learning situation and therefore people's views on teachers and learners were needed. No further information was provided as it was feared that that might bias the data.

The usual procedure of elicitation was used. To avoid the problems encountered by the pilot study trainees were asked to write the names of their tutors, A, B and C, on cards 1, 2 and 3 respectively and the names of six of their peers on the remaining six cards. The order of the triads presented to them was changed to avoid having their tutors as the basis for the first construct. Six constructs were elicited considering the following triads: 7,8,9; 4,5,6; 1,2,3; 3,6,9; 2,5,8 and 1,4,7.

When pairing and singling out the elements the informants were asked to think about them as people that they knew and group them because of any intrinsic characteristic they had in common. Care was taken to check that the constructs were about characteristics of the behaviour of the elements and not things like physical appearance. A further step was to ask trainees to think about how they saw those people as teachers and learners in any situation as long as it had anything to do with the teaching/learning situation.

Note that trainees had seen most of their peers teaching during the Teaching Practice sessions thus they could think about them either as teachers or as learners.

It took trainees the best part of an hour to complete the grid, as anticipated.

4.0 Summary

On the first morning of their teacher training course subjects completed the pre-course questionnaire. On the last day of the course they completed the grid and the post-course questionnaire. The "pre-course" and the "post-course" questionnaires were identical. As for the grid the elements were given and the constructs elicited. The elements consisted of their three tutors plus six of their classmates. Six constructs were elicited.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA* AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

1.0 Introduction

The first part of this chapter provides a description of the analysis of the questionnaires and a summary of the consequent findings. The same procedure will be followed for the grids. Finally the findings of the questionnaires and those of the grids will be put together and some hypotheses that might account for the data will be outlined.

All the analysis of the data in this study has been done from the general to the specific. For the first stages of the analyses the group has been considered as a whole and so has the course. Then the focus of the study has been gradually narrowed down to consider individual informants and particular topics/areas covered during the course.

This approach has been adopted to avoid the usual assumption that averages may not be meaningful when the items being analysed are not amenable to relative precise measures.

2.0 The Questionnaires

2.1 Analysis of the Questionnaires

For the analysis of the questionnaires numbers were assigned to the scale presented to the trainees in the following way:

---

* One of the eighteen participants of the course did not complete the pre-course questionnaire. For this reason the analyses of the data have been done taking only seventeen subjects into account.

+ + +	7
+ +	6
+	5
0	4
-	3
- -	2
- - -	1

Each column, i.e.,"enjoyment","difficulty"and"usefulness"has been considered separately. The results from the"post and pre-course" questionnaires were first compared for the group as a whole and then for each individual informant.

For the whole group the questionnaires have been compared with relation to:

1) the average[11] score for each column, i.e.,"enjoyment"(E), "difficulty"(D) and"usefulness"(U) for all the topics/areas covered during the course;
2) the average score for the part of the course covered by each tutor, i.e., A, B and C;

   Note: As mentioned before B and C shared the topics they taught.
3) the particular topics covered during the course: these included the two topics covered by B/C, and four of the topics covered by A.

The analysis of the questionnaires for individual trainees has been done by comparing all the scores from the pre and the post-course questionnaires:

1) for each topic/area;

2) for the parts of the course covered by A and B/C;

3) for the course as a whole.

2.2 The Findings of the Questionnaires

2.2.1 For the Whole Group

Each of the three points mentioned above will be considered separately.

1) Whole Group - Whole Course

	MEAN			MEDIAN		
	E	D	U	E	D	U
Post-course Q.	5.3	5.2	6.2	5.4	5.2	6.5
Pre-course Q.	4.9	4.8	6.0	5.1	5.1	6.2
Variation	+0.4	+0.4	+0.2	+0.3	+0.1	+0.3

Comments: It should be borne in mind that the above are scores out of a 1 to 7 scale. Nevertheless it seems fair to say that the course came out more or less as expected as the variation between the "pre and the post-course"questionnaire scores was not large. If anything the course turned out as somewhat more enjoyable, more difficult and more useful than expected. As a rule all the scores were above the middle score of 4.0. Actually it is important to stress that the lower half of the 1 to 7 scale was barely used by the informants. The reasons for this are not clear, butsome hypotheses are raised and discussed in chapter V.

The variations shown both by the means and the medians were always positive. It is interesting that the means of E and D on the one hand, and the medians of E and U on the other hand showed identical

increases[12].

As the increases in means and medians differed, and those increases were not too large anyway, it was decided to calculate proper correlation coefficients between the pre and post-course scores for mean scores. The Spearman's Roh coefficient[13] for enjoyment; difficulty and usefulness (mean scores across all topics) were calculated and are as follows:

Aspect	Roh (Pre/Post)	Significance level 0.05
"Enjoyment"	0.44	0.412
"Difficulty"	0.58	0.412
"Usefulness"	0.56	0.412

The correlations are relatively high. All of them are significant - they exceed the critical value of 0.412 (for N = 17) for a significance level of 0.05.

2) Whole Group - different parts of the course

Part of the course taught by A - Part I

(mean scores)

	E	D	U
Post-course scores	5.1	5.1	6.1
Pre-course scores	5.1	4.9	6.0
Variation	-	+0.2	+0.1

Part of the course taught by B and C - Part II

(mean scores)

	E	D	U
Post-course scores	5.5	5.6	6.7
Pre-course scores	4.7	4.8	6.2
Variation	+0.8	+0.8	+0.5

Comments: Again all the variations are non-negative which shows that their reaction to the course exceeded their expectations. Note however the nil variation in enjoyment for the part of the course taught by A, and the small increase for the other two aspects. Their expectations were higher for Part I than for Part II. However their reactions were lower for Part I which resulted in larger increases for Part II than for Part I.

3) Whole Group - particular topics/areas

Topics taught by A

(mean scores)

	Topic 1			Topic 2			Topic 3			Topic 4		
	E	D	U	E	D	U	E	D	U	E	D	U
Post-course Q.	6.2	5.1	6.6	4.5	5.5	6.7	5.5	5.8	6.4	5.5	5.1	6.4
Pre-course Q.	5.8	5.8	6.8	5.3	5.7	6.7	5.2	5.4	6.4	5.4	5.2	6.4
Variation	+0.4	-0.7	-0.2	-0.8	-0.2	-	+0.3	+0.4	-	+0.1	-0.1	-

Comments: The reactions to different topics taught by the same tutor vary. Note the nil difference for usefulness in three out of

the four topics. This also corresponds to the highest scores. Whereas the difference for enjoyment was nil for Part I of the course for these four topics within Part I this varies from -0.8 to +0.4. In this table as more detail is brought in, we have the first negative variations, showing that some topics in this particular aspect did not quite fulfil the students' expectations.

Topics taught by B and C

(mean scores)

	Topic 1			Topic 2		
	E	D	U	E	D	U
Post-course Q.	5.5	5.8	6.9	5.5	5.4	6.5
Pre-course Q.	4.6	5.5	6.5	4.8	4.1	6.0
Variation	+0.9	+0.3	+0.4	+0.7	+1.3	+0.5

Comments: The results on this table apparently show that trainees enjoyed both topics more than they expected. As for difficulty, in topic 2, their reactions were considerably higher than their expectations. Once more this happened when expectations were relatively low. Althought the scores for usefulness were already high the two topics still came out as more useful than expected. Note the score for usefulness for topic one in the post-course questionnaire: 6.9 out of a 7.0 scale.

Summary:

It seems fair to say that there has not been a significant change of opinion if the course is taken as a whole. When the two parts of the course taught by different tutors are considered separately differences emerge: the part of the course taught by B and C came out

as more enjoyable, more difficult and more useful than that covered by A.

When considering particular topics covered during the course the results for the part covered by B and C are quite similar for both topics whereas for the part covered by A there were significant differences in reactions to the different topics.

2.2.2 For Individual Informants

A profile for each individual trainee has been drawn. Some of them will be analysed in detail in the last part of this chapter.

A summary of these findings however is provided in three tables, one for each aspect, i.e.,"enjoyment","difficulty","usefulness" (cf. Appendix 3).

As expected differences in their perceptions emerged: for the course as a whole, for different parts of the course and for particular topics.

3.0 The Grids

3.1 Introduction - How to Measure the Results of a Grid

The repertory grid is a fascinating instrument and when one is confronted with constructs which are meaningful to the person who produced them, which also mean something to us, it is very tempting to go on 'playing' with them, i.e., using different methods of analysis to bring to light the underlying meanings we intuitively think are there.

"The overlap and confusion between grid measures in common use is enormous." (cf. Fransella & Bannister, 1977:60). There are different ways of analysing the same grid and, obviously, different ways of analysing different kinds of grids. There are also computer

programme packages for the analysis of grids. Fransella & Bannister (1977) provide an account of the different grid measures as well as a summary of the various methods of computer analyses at present.

The choice of the most appropriate technique of analysis - like the choice of the type of grid and the method of elicitation - will depend on the purpose of the study.

3.2 The Analysis of the Grids in this Study

As mentioned above the dichotomous grid was the one used for this study.

It is worth mentioning that the trainees were asked to allot the elements either to one or the other pole of the construct. They were not offered the opportunity of saying "not applicable". They did this by ascribing a tick (pair) or a cross (singleton) under each element. As a result a completed grid consisted of 6 constructs and a matrix of ticks and crosses for the 9 elements.

An example of a completed grid is given in Appendix 4 page 1.

The analysis of the grids proceeded from the more general to the more specific by considering the constructs first in terms of the whole group and subsequently in relation to the individuals. This involved the following three steps:

1) the constructs produced were grouped together under super-ordinate categories;
2) those constructs were identified that singled out one of the tutors as opposed to the other two;
3) the allocation of the tutors to the poles of the construct was defined.

3.2.1 Grouping the Constructs

The aim of the grouping was to identify the constructs which occured not only once, but repeatedly in the grids, considering the whole group.

Subsequently, constructs that appeared similar to the analyst were grouped under superordinate categories. This interference by the analyst poses a methodological problem.

According to Kelly's individuality corollary "persons differ from each other in their construction of events" (cf. Kelly, 1955 [1963]:55). "Even the most public of 'constructs' (e.g. those of mathematics or science) are personal in that each of us must individually give them a meaning and make them part of our own system" (cf. Fransella & Bannister, 1977:7).

Thus this step in the procedure, involving the analyst's interpretation of the informants' constructs can be referred to as the analyst's "construing of the constructs".

This proved to be a mammoth task!

It is impossible to know what the person actually meant when using the construct and it is very difficult to group abstract words. Therefore the grouping was done many times. This simultaneously helped the researcher to get increasingly familiar with the constructs in order to achieve a more satisfactory grouping. Both poles of the construct were considered at this stage so that the researcher could grasp the informant's meaning as clearly as possible.

To avoid any problems with the subtleties of the language at this level a native speaker[14] was asked to group the constructs so that the researcher's final grouping and that of the native speaker could be cross-checked.

It is essential to note that no words were added to those that derived from the data. The superordinate categories were not named differently but rather a construct which was considered to account for the whole category was used.

Only one pole of the constructs was considered for the further stages of this analysis since

> the person's choice of an aspect determines both what shall be considered similar and what shall be considered contrasting. If we choose an aspect in which A and B are similar, but in contrast to C, it is important to note that it is the same aspect of all three, A, B, and C, that forms the basis of the construct. With respect to this aspect, A and B are similar and C stands in contrast to them. (cf. Kelly, 1955 [1963]:59)

The word which was used more frequently was the pole of the construct chosen for the presentation of the findings[15]. As it happened all the superordinate categories ended up by being labelled after the pole of the construct which - if we wanted to introduce a value-judgement - could be considered more "positive". This is, however, problematic. In some cases, such as the following, we can quite confidently talk about "positive", if we relate the concepts to teaching: "sensitive", "considerate", "helpful", "stimulating", "confident". However some of the categories cannot be so promptly said to be either "positive" or "negative" as for example, "extrovert", "lively", "open minded".

This has consequences for the later stages of the analysis. (cf. page 33).

3.2.2 Constructs where one of the Tutors was Differentiated

Although the elicitation of the constructs was based on all 9 elements of the grid (i.e. the 3 tutors and the six colleagues) in the

analysis of the allocation of the elements to the poles, only those representing the tutors were considered.

Constructs which were indistinct, i.e., when the three tutors were allocated to the same pole were disregarded at this stage as they did not yield much information about the particular informant's perception of each tutor. Which characteristics were regarded as salient can only be derived from the identification of those constructs where the trainees differentiated among the three tutors.

This involved two steps:

(1) All 3 tutors were considered together and the number of differentiations was identified.

(2) For each tutor the number of times s/he had been differentiated from the other two, was identified.

3.2.3 The Allocation of the Tutor in Relation to the Pole of the Construct

In the cases where a distinction had been made between the three tutors, the pole of the allocation was determined and the result entered into a table. Comments on this point will be made below (cf. page 32).

Table 5 (cf. Appendix 4) represents a survey of the allocations in relation to the poles of the constructs, which provides a picture of the trainees' perception of the tutors.

3.3 The Findings of the Grids

3.3.1 For the Whole Group

The table on the next page summarizes the findings of the first two steps of the analysis presented above. The superordinate categories[16] of the constructs are listed, the number of times they were mentioned

Table 4 - Superordinate Categories of the Constructs

CONSTRUCTS	No. of Mentions*	No. of differentiations	A differentiated	B differentiated	C differentiated
1-"SENSITIVE"	9	9	8	1	-
2-"LIVELY"	9	4	3	-	1
3-"CONSIDERATE"	9	8	5	3	-
4-"HELPFUL"	9	6	4	2	-
5-"OPEN MINDED"	10	6	5	1	-
6-"EXTROVERT"	10	9	4	1	4
7-"CONFIDENT"	8	3	2	1	-
8-"STIMULATING"	3	3	3	-	-
9-"CREATIVE"	3	3	2	-	1
10-"RELAXED"	3	2	1	-	1
11-"CONVENTIONAL"	3	2	1	1	-
12-"SENSE OF HUMOUR"	4	1	1	-	-
13-"ORGANIZED"	2	1	-	1	-
14-"PLEASANT"	3	1	-	1	-
15-"LOGICAL THINKER"	4	-	-	-	-
16-"CONSCIENTIOUS"	2	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	91**	58	39	12	7

and how often the tutors were differentiated. This table shows the importance of the superordinate categories (the more it is mentioned) and of the salience of each of these categories for each tutor.

---

* The number of mentions are out of 17 (number of subjects).

** A total of 102 constructs were produced (17 x 6). However some of them conflated within the same grid and that is why we only have 91 mentions.

Comments on the table:

The first two constructs on the table do not actually represent superordinate categories as there are no other words related to them[17]. This, means that nine out of seventeen trainees used the construct "sensitive" and nine of them used the construct "lively". However for the aims of this study the first construct is much more significant since all the trainees who used it also differentiated the tutors in relation to it. Note that 8 out of nine differentiated A. As for the second construct, only four of the trainees distinguished the tutors.

The same is true for categories 3 "considerate", and 7 "confident": eight out of nine differentiated the tutors in category 3, whereas only 3 out of 8 did the same in category 7. Category 5, "open minded", represents a large category which covers all the constructs related to people's attitude to teaching. This is the category which comprises the largest number of different constructs.

It should be noted that A has been distinguished many more times than either B or C. Some hypotheses that might account for that will be raised and discussed in the last part of this chapter.

3.3.2 For Individual Informants

Table 5 in Appendix 4 page 3 is a representation of how each tutor was distinguished and by whom.

As expected tutors were differentiated more frequently in some of the constructs than in others.

The number of times one tutor was distinguished from the other two has been considered above (cf. Table 4 page 31).

Table 5 shows the actual pole to which each tutor was allocated if a distinction was made at all. Therefore we have the number of times

when each one of the tutors was allotted to the actual pole on the table which is the following:

Tutor	No. of Times
A	22
B	40
C	41

The fact that the categories on the table show that pole of the construct which in most cases coincides with what has been referred to as the "positive" term (cf. page 29) suggests that B and C have been perceived in a more positive way than A. In fact, eight out of the seventeen informants distinguished A from B and C in all the constructs where they made a distinction, and six of them never alloted A to the so-called "positive" poles.

For each of the categories 1, 3 and 5, A only appears on the table once which means he was assigned to the other pole of the construct as many times as B and C appear on the table. While B and/or C are alloted 8 times to category 1, "sensitive"; 7 times to category 3, "considerate"; and 5 times to category 5, "open minded", A appears on the other pole of the construct, which is the negative one.

For category 4, "helpful", A was distinguished four times in contrast to B and C who were singled out only once each.

Summarizing these results we can say that the analysis of the grids suggest that B and C were perceived in a more positive way than A.

4.0 Putting the Results Together: Some Hypotheses that might Account for the Data

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this section is to put the findings of the questionnaires together with those of the grids and at the same time to raise some hypotheses that might account for them.

4.2 For the Whole Group

If we consider the group as a whole we can say that according to the analysis of the questionnaires the course came out more or less as expected. However there was a significant difference of opinion about the part of the course covered by B/C and that covered by A, the part covered by B/C coming out as more enjoyable and useful, although more difficult, than that taught by A. The analysis of the grids suggested that B and C were perceived by the group in a more positive way than A.

Therefore when considering the group as a whole the analyses suggest that trainees perception of the course is related to their perception of the tutors.

4.3 For Individual Informants

As mentioned before trainees distinguished A from B and C most of the time when they happened to make a distinction between the tutors. It might be argued that this was so because B and C shared the topics they covered during the course. Our first hypothesis then would be:

<u>Hypothesis no. 1</u>:

- Perception of the tutor is defined by the perception of the topic.

As it happened nine of the informants distinguished A from B and C but one informant distinguished B from A and C in all the constructs where a distinction was made. The remaining seven perceived the three tutors in different ways, i.e., no clear distinction was made between one and the other two. This disproves our hypothesis. Let's then consider the opposite hypothesis.

Hypothesis no. 2:

- Perception of the topic is defined by the perception of the tutor.

As mentioned before (cf. page 3) this is more likely to happen for young learners and that was one of the reasons why mature learners have been preferred for the aims of this study.

Let's have a look at the subjects who made a clear distinction between A, and B and C (cf. table 5, Appendix 4 and Subjects' Profiles Appendix 5).

These subjects are: 002, 003, 004, 008, 010, 011, 012, 016 and 017. All of them perceived B and C in a more positive way than A.

Four of them, 002, 003, 004 and 008, enjoyed the part of the course taught by A less than they expected whereas they enjoyed more the part of the course covered by B and C. 011, 016 and 017 enjoyed both parts of the course more than they expected but the variation in the part taught by B and C was higher. 012 enjoyed both parts of the course less than he expected whereas 010 enjoyed the part covered by A more than he expected and the one taught by B and C less than he expected.

Let's have a closer look at 010 and at one of the subjects who did not enjoy the part of the course covered by A as much as they expected.

003 enjoyed both topics covered by B/C more than expected. Eight of the topics covered by A did not come out as enjoyable as expected and for the other four there was no variation.

010 did not enjoy one of the topics covered by B/C as much as expected. There was no variation for the other topic. Four of the topics covered by A showed no variation, three of them showed a negative variation whereas the remaining five showed a positive variation. As we can see the tendency is very diverse.

No further comments with regard to"difficulty"or"usefulness" will be made here as the comments made for enjoyment seem to be enough to disproof hypothesis no. 2. However the interested reader is referred to Appendix 5 where a profile of each trainee mentioned above is provided.

Hypothesis no. 3:

- Topic is more important than teacher.

In this case the topic would be winning over the perception of the teacher. This might be the case because of the topic itself, their previous experience, the interaction with the group to name a few possibilities.

There seems to be evidence in the data to prove this hypothesis. 003 was the only subject who consistently found all the topics covered by A not more enjoyable or useful than expected. All the other subjects in the study perceived different topics covered by the same tutor differently.

If we consider 016 we can see that her reaction to the course with regard to enjoyment, difficulty and usefulness was higher than her expectations. When considering the reactions to the parts of the

course we can see that the only decrease occurred in "usefulness" in the part of the course taught by B/C. It might be argued that her expectations were too high (7 - top of the scale) which accounts for her disappointment.

Actually for one of the topics covered by A her expectations and her reactions are top of the scale. She enjoyed most of the subjects taught by A more than she expected although her perception of A is quite negative.

This is also true for 010, 011, and 017.

Hypothesis no. 4:

- Trainees perceptions of their tutors vary according to previous formal teacher training.

Five of the trainees had already had previous teacher training: 002 and 005 have a PGCE and 003, 010, 016 have a B.Ed. (cf. table A Appendix 1). 005 is the only one out of these five who does not distinguish A from B/C. On the other hand there are other trainees who had not had any training before who distinguish A from B/C and one (018) who distinguishes B from A/C. This disproves our hypothesis.

Of course there are many other hypothesis which might account for the data which are outside the scope of this study, e.g. sex differences, learners' personality, tutors' personality, etc.

For example it is not possible to account for sex differences as the only woman tutor (C) is not in charge of a subject on her own. It might be worth mentioning however that the only subject who perceived her in a very negative way is 001 who is a priest. (!)

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

1.0 Introduction

In the first part of this chapter, some conclusions and inplications that emerged from the analyses of the data in this study will be outlined. In the second part methodological problems which occurred and consequent implications for further research will be discussed. Some suggestions on the potential of the repertory grid technique applied to this field will be made.

2.0 Summary of the Analyses and Consequent Implications

2.1 Summary of the Analyses

The assumption that a positive perception of the teacher/tutor facilitates the learning process is one I believe to be justified by experience if not by experiment. This study was an attempt to draw an experiment to justify this assumption.

The results of the analyses of the data suggest that for the informants in this study the perception of the parts of the course covered by different tutors was positively correlated to their perception of the tutors themselves. Although they differentiated topics within the same area covered by one tutor their global perception of each area, as a rule, varied in the same way their perception of the tutors did, especially with regard to 'enjoyment'.

The results of the analyses can be summarized as follows:

a) with only one exception a distinction between topic and tutor was made (cf. page 36 and Appendix 5 page 2 Profile of the subject 003).

b) as a rule the perception of the topic and that of the tutor were positively correlated, i.e., when the perception of the tutor was more positive it was more likely that the topic taught by that tutor was perceived in a more positive way.

2.2 Implications

Definite conclusions can not be drawn from such a small sample. However the results of this study point to the same direction of the current view in education which stresses the importance of the interpersonal relationship in the classroom (cf. Pope & Keen,1981:19). This was discussed in more detail in chapter I (cf. page 2). Note, however, that this study only focused on one aspect of the interpersonal relationship in the classroom, i.e., the teacher/learner interaction.

The analysis of the grids showed that for the subjects involved in this study "sensitivity" and "consideration" on the part of the teacher/tutor are important.

Rogers (1983:126) calls our attention to the importance of the teacher being

> a real person in the classroom ... being with the student in a sensitive understanding of his or her own interests, desires, directions ... simply understanding the student from their <u>own</u> point of view, not the teacher's.

It might be argued that what Rogers is advocating for education in general is of particular interest for the teacher trainer. It is not enough for the tutor to talk to the trainees about the new trends in education and tell them that they should behave as people in the classroom. The tutors themselves should be real persons in the interaction with the trainees. And this is not a matter of providing a model because if the interaction with the tutor has positive outcomes

for the trainee teacher this goes beyond copying a model later on when the trainee is in his/her classroom. I would suggest that if the tutor is able to stand in the trainees' shoes the trainees will be encouraged to do the same, i.e., put themselves in the teacher's (tutor) position in an interaction where they are supposed to behave as learners. This might be a first step to break the old pattern of the teacher/learner interaction where everyone involved has a predetermined role to play. It may be the case that teachers (trainees) will be able to start thinking more carefully about how to relate to their learners if they can put themselves in the position of their tutors to start with.

It is sometimes surprising to see adult learners (teachers, many times) behaving as adolescents, being very critical about their teachers and loosing sight of the learning process as a whole. The learners' role appears to be very appealing and whenever one is confronted with the choice, stepping back into it is probably the most comfortable position. Yes, it is important that teachers behave as "real people" in the classroom but it is also important that learners do the same. Sometimes it seems that too much is being asked from the teachers who did not have this experience themselves. To break the vicious circle it might be an idea to make tutors aware of the importance of interaction and really behave as people in the classroom. The trainee teachers would then have the chance of having the experience of learning under different circumstances, under more "receptive" circumstances and this might help them become more aware of the learning process and change attitudes in their classrooms. This might lead the teachers to have "a sensitive awareness of the way the process of education and learning seems <u>to the student</u>" (cf. Rogers, 1983:125)

3.0 Methodological Conclusions

3.1 The Questionnaires

3.1.1 Methodological Problems

As mentioned before,in the questionnaires most of the entries were in the higher part of the scale. This might have been so because of the way the scacle was presented to the subjects, i.e., with (+) and (-). They might have interpreted the lower part of the scale as negative and therefore avoided using it. It is always easier to say positive things than to say negative things. They were aware of the fact that they were evaluating the course because of the format of the questionnaire.

This posed a problem for the interpretation of the questionnaires. As nearly only the higher part of the scale was used, the variation within that part had to be considered rather than the scale as a whole. That is why it was preferred to compare the "pre and post-course" questionnaires for all the steps of the analysis. To compare the variation between their expectations and reactions to the course it did not matter which part of the scale had been used.

3.1.2 Implications for Further Research

It is very difficult to make suggestions with regard to further research as different people react in different ways. This scale was used before (cf. Allwright, 1982, unpublished) and with those subjects no problems arose - the whole scale has been used.

It might be the case that for course evaluation nothing that can be interpreted as "negative" should be used, as subjects will be more reluctant to put down on paper "negative" values about a course. Especially in the case of the course in this study, where the subjects

were willing to get the certificate and were paying an attendance fee, they might have been willing to "think positively" about the course.

3.2 The Repertory Grid Technique

3.2.1 Methodological Problems

The elicitation of the grid did not present any further problems than those antecipated. Those were concerning the fact that the grid was elicited in a group. The fact that a pilot study was conducted, however, proved to be extremely helpful as this pilot study brought to light a few issues (cf. page 17).

The major methodological problem the grid presented, however, was with regard to its interpretation. These have been described in chapter IV (cf. page 28)when the analyses of the data was considered. Some hypotheses that might account for these difficulties are:

a) the inexperience of the analyst;

b) the fact that the grid was elicited from a group and consequent implications (as discussed in chapter IV, cf. pages 28-29).

3.2.2 Implications and Suggestions for Further Research

I would like to try to draw a parallel between Kelly's theory of Personal Constructs and Rogers' suggestion that the attitude of the teacher "standing in other's shoes, of viewing the world through the student's eyes" facilitates learning. (cf. Rogers, 1983:125).

"Kelly devised repertory grid technique as a method for exploring personal construct systems. It is an attempt to stand in other's shoes, to see their world as they see it, to understand their situation, their concerns" (cf. Fransella & Bannister, 1977:5).

It seems fair to suggest that the repertory grid technique could be used to help teachers understand what their learners' view of the learning process is. The technique has been used in educational research, as mentioned before, but to my knowledge, not in the ordinary classroom for helping teachers and learners to become more conscious of their own views of the learning process.

Pope has used the technique to outline the "frame of reference" for student teachers to monitor how this would influence their teaching behaviour. (cf. Pope & Keen, 1981:114-36). One of the assumptions behind the project was that "the student teacher would also benefit from reflecting on the way he or she construes teaching." (ibid.;199).

What I am suggesting is that the technique be used to help teachers and learners to become more aware of their construing of the learning process. And since teachers realized how learners view learning it would be possible for them "to stand in the learners' shoes."

Another suggestion is that the technique be used to define the elements of "tone-management"[18] (cf. Allwright, 1984) for one particular group of learners in a given situation. A study of "tone-management" might be possible then. It is being suggested that learners' perception of what makes the classroom atmosphere pleasant is outlined with the help of the repertory grid technique.

After a few groups of learners had worked with the technique it might be the case that the elements that occurred more frequently could be defined as the elements of "tone".

Summarizing, two different suggestions for further research to be undertaken using the repertory grid technique are being made:

1) Use the technique to make teachers and learners more aware

of the learners' view of learning. This would probably help the learners to commit themselves more actively to the learning process and the teachers to better understand their learners.

2) Use the technique to define the elements involved in "tone-management" with a view to undertaking a study on "tone-management" in the future.

NOTES

(1) See especially Hargreaves (1972): Interpersonal Relations and Education, RKP, London.

(2) Stevick refers to the work of Curran (1966; 1968; 1972) when describing "defensive" learning.

(3) A detailed description of the research methodology is provided in chapter III.

(4) I should like to thank Dr. Thomas and especially Dr. Harri Augstein from the Centre for Study of Human Learning at Burnel University for kindly discussing with me the repertory grid technique with regard to this study.

(5) It is of particular interest the work of the authors themselves, i.e., Pope & Keen(1981) and that developed at the Centre for Study of Human Learning, direct by L. Thomas, at Brunel University.

(6) See especially the work of Harri Augstein (1982).

(7) Details of the RSA Preparatory Certificate are provided in Appendix 1 (RSA,83:5-8).

(8) A variation of this kind of grid is one where the person is asked to rank the elements from most like to the most opposite or to rate them on a seven point scale (cf. Fransella & Bannister, 1977:6).

(9) I should like to thank the Centre for the Study of Human Learning for their kind permission to my using their format of the repertory grid sheet.

(10) I should like to thank my colleagues from the MAELT who so kindly helped me with this pilot study.

(11) As it were, the median, the mean and the mode were calculated for each step of the analysis. The averages (means) happened not to be very different from the medians. Given that, and as the concept of average is intuitively more appealing than that of median it was decided to use averages instead of medians for most of the analysis. In the first table, however, the mean and the median will be provided to show their similitude.

(12) Beforehand it was expected that E and U would be highly and positively correlated, and that increases (decreases) in one of them would be accompanied by similar increases (decreases) on the other. In contrast no high correlation was expected between D and either of the other two aspects. Correlations between each two out of the three aspects were calculated using the Spearman's Rho coefficient for median scores. The results were:

	Pre-course scores	Post-course scores
Roh (E/D)	0.92	0.98
Roh (E/U)	0.89	0.96
Roh (D/U)	0.90	0.94

Significance level 0.01 (for N = 17) 0.582

All the correlations are very high but still the one between E and D is the highest one for both the pre and the post-course scores.

(13) How the Spearman's Roh coefficient was calculated.

For each aspect , E, D, U, the subjects were ranked twice, firstly, according to how high each of them scored that aspect (mean score across all topics) in the pre-course questionnaire, and secondly according to how s/he did in the post-course one. The Spearman's

correlation coefficient between"pre and post-course"rankings were calculated for each aspect.

(14) I should like to thank my colleague B. Duff who so kindly helped me with this stage of the analysis.

(15) Table 4 on page 31 provides a list of these superordinate categories. For those who are not familiar with the repertory grid technique it is interesting to note that the constructs which occurred more often in the data are not the same ones which came out of the pilote study. This is not surprising since the pilot study dealt with different subjects (learners) construing about different elements (teachers).

(16) Table 4A in Appendix 5 provides a list of the actual constructs used by the informants under each superordinate category.

(17) The same is true for constructs (11) and (16) however these have not been brought into the analysis as the number of mentions as well as the number of differentiations was not considered to be significant.

(18) "Tone-management refers to the important business of establishing the appropriate socio-emotional atmosphere for the interaction" (cf. Allwright, 1984:162).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALLWRIGHT, R.L. (1972) "Prescription and Description in the Training of Language Teachers" in Quistgaard et al. (eds.) Proceedings, Vol. III, of The Third AILA Congress, Copenhagen, Julius Croos Verlag, Heidelberg, 150-166.

———————— (1982) "201 Student Perception Survey", Report Prepared for the American Language Institute, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, Unpublished.

———————— (1983) "Classroom-Centred Research on Language Teaching and Learning: A Brief Historical Overview" in Tesol Quartely Vol.17, No.2, 191-204.

———————— (1984) "The Importance of Interaction in Classroom Language Learning" in Applied Linguistics, Vol.5, No.2, 156-171.

BANNISTER, D. & FRANSELLA, F. (1971 /1980/): Inquiring Man, Middlesex, Penguin.

BANNISTER, D. & MAIR, J.M.M. (1968): The Evaluation of Personal Constructs, London, Academic Press.

BERGER, C.R. (1979): "Beyond Initial Interaction, Uncertainty, Understanding and the Development of Interpersonal Relationships" in Giles & St. Clair (eds.) - Language and Social Psychology, Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

COHEN, A.D. & HOSENFELD, C. (1981) "Some Uses of Mentalistic Data in Second Language Research" in Language Learning, 31/2, 285-313.

COHEN, L. & MANION, L. (1980): Research Methods in Education, London, Croom Helm.

CURRAN, C.A. (1966): "Counseling in the educative process: a foreign language learning integration", Unpublished.

———————— (1968): Counseling and Psychotherapy: The Pursuit of Values, New York, Sheed and Ward.

CURRAN, C.A. (1972): Counseling-Learning A Whole Person Model for Education, New York, Grume & Stratton.

EARLY, P. (ed.) (1983): "Humanistic Approaches: An Empirical View", ELT Documents 113, The British Council, London.

FRANSELLA, F. & BANNISTER, D. (1977): A Manual for Repertory Grid Technique, London, Academic Press.

FURLONG, V. (1976): "Interaction Sets in the Classroom: Towards a Study of Pupil Knowledge" in Stubbs, M. & Delamont, S. (eds.) Explorations in Classroom Observation, London, John Wiley & Sons.

HARGREAVES, D.H. (1972): Interpersonal Relations and Education, London RKP.

HARRI AUGSTEIN, E.S.(1978): Reflecting on Structures of Meaning: A Process of Learning-To-Learn" in Fransella, F. (ed.): Personal Construct Psychology 1977, London, Academic Press.

———————— (1982): "Learning-to-learn languages: the self-organised learner and the 'conversational' curriculum" publication from the Centre for the Study of Human Learning, Brunel University, Uxbridge.

HATCH, E. & FARHADAY, H. (1982): Research Design and Statistics for Applied Linguistics, Rowley, Mass., Newbury House.

KEEN, T.R. (1977): "TARGET-Teaching Appraisal by Repertory Grid Techniques" Paper presented to the Second International Congress on Personal Construct Theory, Christ Church, Oxford, July, 1977.

KELLY, G.A. (1955 [1963]): A Theory of Personality, New York, The Norton Library.

———————— (1966): "Behaviour is an Experiment", in Bannister, D. (ed.): Perspectives in Personal Construct Theory, London, Academic Press.

LANCY, D.F. (1978): "The Classroom as Phenomenon" in Bar-Tal & Saxe (eds.). Social Psychology of Education, New York, John Willey & Son.

NASH, R. (1973): Classrooms Observed, London, RKP.

——— (1976a): Teacher expectations and pupil learning, London, RKP.

——— (1976b): "Pupils' expectations of their teachers" in Stubbs, M. & Delamont, S. (eds.), Explorations in Classroom Observation, New York, John Wiley & Sons.

OCHSNER (1979): "A Poetics of Second-Language Acquisition" in Language Learning, Vol.29, No.1, 53-80.

POPE, M. (1978): "Monitoring and Reflecting in Teacher Training" in Fransella, F. (ed.): Personal Construct Psychology 1977, London, Academic Press.

POPE, M.L. & KEEN, T.R. (1981): Personal Construct Psychology and Education, London, Academic Press.

RIVERS, W.M. (1964): The Psychologist and the Foreign Language Teacher, Chicago: University of Chicago.

ROBSON, C. (1973): Experiment, Design and Statistics in Psychology, Middlesex, Penguin.

ROGERS, C. (1983): Freedom To Learn For The 80's, Columbus, Charles, E. Merril.

SCHNUCK, R.A. (1978): "Applications of Social Psychology to Classroom Life" in Bar-Tal, D. & Saxe, L. (eds.): Social Psychology of Education, New York, John Willey & Son.

STEVICK, E.W. (1973): "Review of Curran 1972" in Language Learning 23: 259-71.

——— (1974): "Language Instruction Must Do an About-Face" in MLJ 58:379-84.

——— (1976): Memory, Meaning & Method, Rowley Mass., Newbury House.

——— (1980): Teaching Languages - A Way and Ways, Rowley Mass., Newbury House.

STEVICK, E.W. (1982): Teaching and Learning Languages, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

———— (1984): "Talking shop: humanism and harmony in language teaching" in ELT Journal 38/2:103-7.

THOMAS, L.F. (1974): "Focusing: Exhibiting the Meanings in a Grid". Publication from the Centre for the Study of Human Learning, Brunel University, Uxbridge.

———— (1976a): "An Outline Introduction to Personal Construct Theory: And its Implications for Education", (mimeo) Centre for the Study of Human Learning, Brunel University, Uxbridge.

———— (1976b): "Eliciting a Repertory Grid" Publication from the Centre for the Study of Human Learning, Brunel University, Uxbridge.

———— (1978): "A Personal Construct Approach to Learning in Education, Training and Therapy - Introduction/Learning and Meaning" in Fransella, F. (ed.), Personal Construct Psychology 1977, London, Academic Press.

YEOMANS, K.A. (1968): Statistics for the Social Scientist, Vol.2, Middlesex, Penguin.

APPENDIX 1

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

- The RSA Preparatory Certificate Course

- Table A - Details about the Subjects of the Study

Preparatory Certificate for the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language to Adults

1 AIMS OF THE SCHEME

The scheme aims mainly to provide pre-service training in EFL teaching.

2 TARGET POPULATION

The Certificate is intended for those without previous experience who wish to enter the profession and for those teachers with no previous training in this particular field.

3 ENTRY REQUIREMENTS

Candidates are required:

(a) to follow at least 80% of an approved course of study

(b) to be at least 20 years old by the date of the commencement of the course

(c) to have a good standard of education, e.g., University Matriculation standard (2 'A' levels and 3 'O' levels) or equivalent

(d) to have a standard of English, both written and spoken, equivalent to that of an educated native speaker. Oral competence is particularly important. The attention of course directors and potential candidates is drawn to the existence of the scheme for Overseas Teachers of English.

Course directors may use their discretion in admitting to courses candidates who do not fulfil the above but it should be borne in mind that candidates need to be of a standard comparable to that specified in (c) and (d) above.

4 COURSE REQUIREMENTS

4.1 Establishments are required to seek approval for their courses. Applications for approval should be made on Form ET/2/P. It is most important that schemes should be submitted for approval as early as possible before the proposed beginning of the course.

Applications for approval will normally only be considered from those centres where the Further Education Scheme has operated for a minimum of two consecutive years.

4.2 The following notes on courses might be helpful. A set of detailed Notes for Guidance is sent to all centres seeking approval.

(i) Centres should be either aided or maintained or, if independent, recognized as efficient by the British Council. The status of overseas centres should be made clear.

(ii) The minimum number of hours for the course should be 100. This should include 6 hours minimum supervised practice teaching [of foreign students] observed by the tutor and a minimum of 8 hours directed observation of *live* lessons (not video or film). Micro-teaching using foreign students is included in practice teaching. Peer-group teaching is not. These figures should be regarded as representing the absolute minimum required.

(iii) Centres should ensure that there is adequate provision of classes for teaching practice. Such classes should contain no fewer than 10 adult students.

(iv) The number of staff should depend on the size of the course. Where there is only one person to run the course there should be provision for outside lecturers. At least one member of staff should have had suitable teacher-training experience in the field of EFL and at least one member of the staff should hold the RSA Certificate in the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language to Adults.

(v) Centres are required to seek annual re-approval of their courses in June.

(vi) Courses may run at any time during the year.

5 SYLLABUS

The term syllabus is used to mean the general content areas covered and is not to be understood as a detailed syllabus specification.

5.1 Purpose

The Syllabus has been designed with three groups of people in mind – trainees, course tutors, and course assessors and course tutors.

For Trainees:-

The Syllabus is intended to give trainees an indication of what they will be studying on a course and to remind them during the course that awareness and attitude are often as important as knowledge.

For Assessors:-

The Syllabus is intended to remind assessors of the aims of the scheme as a whole and provide an initial reference point against which to assess courses.

61

For Course Tutors:-
The Syllabus is intended to guide prospective course tutors when submitting their courses for approval and to show current course tutors what their courses should be trying to achieve.

5.2 The Form

Here the Syllabus is presented as a series of apparently discrete areas. Such a form of presentation is merely a matter of convenience. Therefore, when planning and running their courses, tutors are encouraged to integrate and to sequence the apparently separate parts of the syllabus in whichever ways they feel are of most benefit to their particular group of trainees.

The Syllabus makes no explicit reference to training methodology. However, course tutors are encouraged to use with their trainees those methods that they hope their trainees will use in their teaching. In order to do this it is essential that trainees should draw on both direct and indirect experience of real teaching situations and it is advisable that course tutors make use of not only traditional lecturing and discussion training methods but also, for example, of pair work, group work, self-assessment activities, self-access exercises and autonomous learning projects.

5.3 The Preparatory Certificate as an Initial Training Scheme

The general aim of the scheme is to prepare trainees for their entry into the profession of teaching EFL; it is therefore a pre-service/initial scheme. This means that courses will concentrate on the practical rather than on the academic and theoretical and that they will provide a broad perspective of current classroom practice rather than one which is narrow. Also courses should make explicit provision for showing how trainees might extend their initial insights and experiences after and beyond the course – for example, through contact with professional bodies, the reading of relevant journals and magazines, the use of appropriate teacher reference material, attendance at all kinds of formal and informal discussions, training schemes, courses and conferences.

5.4 Syllabus Areas

The aim of this initial scheme is to develop:-

Practical awareness of: *Learners* – Cultural and individual needs, approaches to learning difficulties, and the motivation of adult learners.

Language – Linguistic form, function and meaning including, e.g., a knowledge of grammar and its terminology, appreciation of structure and function; an understanding of the principles of selection and grading and an introduction to how subject matter and context affects language, and the importance of phonology.

Materials – Course books and supplementary materials and their teachers' books; provision of special interest texts; authentic and non-authentic materials; commercially produced and teacher made materials and reference works for both teachers and learners.

Practical ability in: *Classroom Management and Lesson Planning* – The ability to arrange the physical environment appropriately for different learning situations and to establish an appropriate atmosphere for learning. The ability to plan both individual lessons and a series of lessons appropriate to student needs.

e.g. general procedure: setting up group work
possible techniques: deciding on size and composition of groups
- giving instructions on group tasks
- giving instructions on getting into groups
- ensuring that all groups are working appropriately

Presentation and Practice of New Language – The ability to select language items appropriate to students' needs and level, to divide the items into learnable units, to present the language clearly and efficiently to students, to devise and operate appropriate activities for the controlled and free practice of the language presented and to check learning and understanding at all stages of the process.

e.g. General procedure: checking of learning and understanding
Possible techniques: devising context checking questions
- using questions to check understanding of forms, concept and function of language
- devising non-verbal checks of understanding and learning
- using simple tests of achievement

Developing the Skills of Reading, Listening, Speaking and Writing – The ability to develop the four skills using techniques which require not only their individual development but also their integration; to select appropriate materials and to have the ability to use a wide range of techniques to this end.

e.g. General procedure: improving global listening ability
Possible techniques: deciding on the aims of a lesson within a series of lessons
- selecting listening texts of the right length and level of difficulty
- devising tasks or questions which check general understanding

6 ASSESSMENT SCHEME

6.1 Assessment is carried out on a continuous basis. Trainees are assessed in all the syllabus areas and particular emphasis is given to the trainee's ability to foster learning in their students and the training and use of the English language is an integral part of the assessment.

Certificates are awarded with or without endorsement as follows:

(i) The Preparatory Certificate for the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language to Adults is awarded to candidates who have satisfactorily fulfilled all the requirements of the scheme. They will have shown potential for further development after the course, an awareness of language learning problems and of classroom techniques. Successful candidates should be able to produce lessons relevant to their students' needs in all aspects of the language. They will continue to need guidance from their employers to help them to develop their potential and broaden their range of skills as teachers.

(ii) Certificates endorsed 'At Pass B Standard' are awarded to those who have fulfilled the requirements for the award of the certificate and have exceeded that level of achievement either in the area of classroom technique or language awareness. This latter will have been demonstrated through the analysis of language into appropriate teaching units or the preparation and selection of effective teaching materials rather than through simple linguistic awareness. Experience suggests that these trainees will have excelled in one of the two areas, but such certificates could be awarded to candidates who have shown potential and have improved in both areas. Although they will continue to need guidance, these candidates are likely to be more independent in the area(s) in which they have performed well on the course.

(iii) Candidates awarded certificates endorsed 'At Pass A Standard' will not only have improved considerably as a result of the course but will also have shown skill and awareness in the areas of classroom technique and language awareness as defined above. When taking up their first posts, candidates who have been awarded this endorsement will need considerably less guidance from their employers.

6.2 A Certificate will be awarded to candidates who have successfully followed an approved course of study. It will be awarded on the basis of assessment by the course tutor of both practical and written work. This assessment will be validated by an external course assessor appointed by the Board. The assessor will visit the course on two different occasions to assess the general standard of teaching practice and written work. On both occasions the assessor will inspect written work, observe practice teaching and evaluate the general level of the course.

Results will be issued within one month of the end of the course. Certificates will be sent to centres as soon as possible thereafter.

6.3 An annual report on the progress of the examination will be published. It is not possible to report on the performance of individual candidates. The Board cannot enter into correspondence with individual candidates about their results.

Table A - Details about the Subjects of the Study

Subject's No. Sex/Age/ Nationality	Formal Teacher Training	EFL/ESL Experience	Teaching Other Languages	Present Occupation
001 - M - 25 American		Private Tuition		Grad. stud. Master of Divinity (84)
002 - F - 34 British	PGCE		French/ Italian Second. School	Secretary
003 - F - 26 British	B.Ed. in English and Education	Private tuition Arabic speakers(all levels) ESL		Class teacher children-ESL (abroad)
004 - M - 27 British		Private tuition		Undergrad. English/His. (84)
005 - F - 22 British	PGCE			Grad. stud. PGCE
006 - F - 27 British				Actress Freelance Writer
007 - M - 26 Australian		Teaching abroad		EFL teacher abroad
008 - F - 24 British				Unemployed
009 - F - 24 British	Summer lang. teaching seminar Geneva	Private tuition abroad		Bilingual secretary
010 - M - 27 British	B.Ed. in Education	ESP-ESL to 'O' level Private tuition		Teacher of English abroad
011 - F - 22 British		Private tuition to children		Secretary
012 - M - 23 British	Specific for work	Conversation		Unemployed
013 - F - 26 British				Administrative assistant

Subject's No. Sex/Age/ Nationality	Formal Teacher Training	EFL/ESL Experience	Teaching Other Languages	Present Occupation
014 - F - 25 British				Unemployed
015 - M - 35 British				Translator
016 - F - 26 Australian	B.Ed. trained to teach Eng. and History	Teenager migrants in Australia		Teacher
017 - F - 25 British				Assistant catering manager
018 - F - 48 British	Nursery school teacher	Teaching abroad since 1980		Teacher EFL (abroad)

APPENDIX 2

DATA COLLECTION

- "Pre and Post-Course" Questionnaires

- The Repertory Grid Sheet

CONFIDENTIAL

University of Lancaster
Department of Linguistics
M.A. English Language Teaching 83/84

Collection of data for the dissertation to be submitted as part of the requirements for the degree.

Pre-Course Questionnaire

NAME: _____

Note: Each participant in this experiment will be assigned a code number therefore remaining anonymous.

Very high + + +
+ +
+
0
-
- -
Very low - - -

e.g. Learning to drive:

	Enjoyment	Difficulty	Usefulness
Reading a driving manual	- -	0	+ +
Watching films about good driving	+ + +	- - -	-
Driving practice on the road	- - -	+ + +	+ + +
Listening to lectures	- - -	0	- - -

During this training course, how do you feel about the different activities and topics that will be involved?
Please indicate your expectations for each item.

Very High + + +
+ +
+
0
-
- -
Very Low - - -

	Enjoyment	Difficulty	Usefulness
Language Analysis			
Pronunciation			
Presentation of New Lang. Items			
* Practice			
Teaching Vocabulary			
Skills Work – listening			
Skills Work – reading			
Skills Work – speaking			
Skills Work – writing			
Timetabling			
Using Published Materials			
Lesson Planning			
Testing			
Teaching Different Levels			
Teaching Abroad			
** Classroom Management			
Using Laboratories			

* Practice - How to deal with different kinds of activities i.e. from controlled to freer kinds of activities

** Classroom Management - Giving instructions, dealing with group dynamics among others.

Thank you very much for your help

M.H. Kubrusly - June, 84

What are your reactions to the different activities and topics that have been covered during this training course?
Please indicate how you feel about each item in the table below.

Very High + + +
+ +
+
0
-
- -
Very Low - - -

	Enjoyment	Difficulty	Usefulness
Language Analysis			
Pronunciation			
Presentation of New Lang. Items			
* Practice			
Teaching Vocabulary			
Skills Work – Listening			
Skills Work – Reading			
Skills Work – Speaking			
Skills Work – Writing			
Timetabling			
Using Published Materials			
Lesson Planning			
Testing			
Teaching Different Levels			
Teaching Abroad			
** Classroom Management			
Using Laboratories			

* Practice - How to deal with different kinds of activities i.e. from controlled to freer kinds of activities.

** Classroom Management - Giving instructions, dealing with group dynamics among others.

Thank you very much for your help.

M.H. Kubrusly - June 1984

APPENDIX 3

PERCEPTIONS OF THE COURSE FOR INDIVIDUAL INFORMANTS

- Table 1 "Enjoyment"

- Table 2 "Difficulty"

- Table 3 "Usefulness"

Key

-	no variation between "pre and post-course" scores
↗	positive variation between "pre and post-course" scores, i.e., reactions exceeded expectations
↘	negative variation between "pre and post-course" scores, i.e., reactions were lower than expectations
	the informant did not score this particular item

CENTRE FOR THE STUDY OF HUMAN LEARNING

COPYRIGHT 1973

PAIR	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	E6	E7	E8	E9	SINGLETON
C1										C1
C2										C2
C3										C3
C4										C4
C5										C5
C6										C6

Table 1 - Perceptions of the Course

"Enjoyment"

TUTORS	TOPICS	SUBJECTS																
		001	002	003	004	005	006	007	008	009	010	011	012	013	014	016	017	018
B/C	Lang. Anal.	-	↗	↗	↘	↗	↗	↘	↗	↗	-	↗		↘	↘	↗	↗	↗
	Pronunciation	-	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	-	↗	↘	↗	↘	↘	-	-	↗	↘
A	Pres. Lang. Items	-	↘	-	↗	↗	-	↗	↘	↗	-	↗	↘	↗	-	↗	↘	↗
	Practice	↘	↗	-	↗	-	↗	↘	-	-	↗	-	↘	↗	-	↗	-	-
	Teach. Voc.	↗	↘	↘	-	↗	↗	↘	-	↗	↗	↗	-	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗
	Listening	-	-	-	-	↗		↗	-	↘	↗	↘	↘	↘	↗	↗	-	↘
	Reading	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘		↗	↘	-	-	↗	-	-	↗	-	-	↘
	Speaking	-	↘	↘	-	↗		-	↗	-	↗	↗	-	-	↗	↗	-	↗
	Writing	-	↘	↘	↘	↗		↗	↘	↗	↗	↗	↘	↗	↗	-	↘	↗
	Timetabling	-	↗	↘	↘	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	-	↗	↗	-	-	↘	↗	↘
	Using Pub. Mat.	↗	↗	↘	↘	↗	-	↘	↘	-	↘	↘	↗	↘	-	↘	↘	-
	Lesson Planning	-	-	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	-	↘	↘	↗	↘	-	-	↘	↗	↘
	Teach. Dif. Lev.	↗	↘	-	↗	↗	↗	↘	↘	↗	-	↗	-	↗	↗	-	↗	-
	Class. Manag.	-	-	↘	↗	↗	↗	↘	-	↗	↘	↗	↗	-	↗	↗	↘	↗
Whole Course		↗	↗	↘	↘	↗	↗	↘	↗	↗	↗	↗	↘	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗
Part I (A)		↗	↘	↘	↘	↗	↗	↘	↘	↗	↗	↗	↘	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗
Part II (B/C)		-	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↘	↗	↗	↘	↗	↘	↘	↘	↗	↗	↗

Table 2 - Perceptions of the Course

"Difficulty"

TUTORS	TOPICS	SUBJECTS																
		001	002	003	004	005	006	007	008	009	010	011	012	013	014	016	017	018
B/C	Lang. Anal.	-	↗	-	-	↗	↗	↗	-	↗	-	↘	↘	↗	↗	↗	↘	-
	Pronunciation	-	↗	↗	-	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	-	↘	↘	↗	-	↗	↗	-
A	Pres. Lang. Items	-	↗	-	↗	-	-	-	↗	↗	-	↗	↘	-	-	↘	↘	↗
	Practice	↘	↗	-	↗	↗	-	↘	↗	↗	-	-	↘	-	↘	↘	-	↗
	Teach. Voc.	-	-	-		↗	↘	↗	-	-	↗	↗		↗	↗	-	-	↗
	Listening	↗	↘	-	↗	↗		↘	↘	-	↘	-	-	-	↘	↗	-	↗
	Reading	↗	-	-	↗	↗		↘	↘	↗	-	↘	↘	-	↘	↗	↘	↗
	Speaking	↘	↗	↘	↗	↗		↘	↘	↘	-	↘	↘	↘	↘	↗	↘	↘
	Writing	-	↗	-	↗	↗		↘	↘	-	-	-	↘	↘	↘	↗	↘	↗
	Timetabling	↗	↗	-	↗	↗	↗	↘	↘	↗	-	-	-	↗	↗	↘	↘	↗
	Using Pub. Mat.	-	-	-	↗	↘	↗	-	-	↗	↗	↘	↘	↘	-	↗	↗	-
	Lesson Planning	-	-	↗	↗	↗	-	↘	-	-	↗	-	-	↘	-	↗	↘	↗
	Teach. Dif. Lev.	↘	↗	-	↗	↗	↗	-	-	-	↗	-	↗	-	↗	↗	↗	↗
	Class. Manag.	↘	-	↗	↘	↘	↗		↗	↗	-	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	-	-
Whole Course		↘	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↘	↗	↗	↗	↘	↘	-	↘	↗	↘	↗
Part I (A)		↘	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↘	↘	↗	↗	↘	↘	↘	↘	↗	↗	↗
Part II (B/C)		-	↗	↗	-	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	-	↘	↘	↗	↗	↗	↗	-

Table 3 - Perceptions of the Course

"Usefulness"

TUTORS	TOPICS	SUBJECTS																
		001	002	003	004	005	006	007	008	009	010	011	012	013	014	016	017	018
B/C	Lang. Anal.	↗	-	-	-	↗	-	-	↗	-	↗	↗	↘	-	↗	-	-	-
	Pronunciation	-	↗	-	↘	-	↗	↗	↗	↗	↘	↗	-	↗	-	↘	↗	↗
A	Pres. Lang. Items	↗	-	↘	↗	↗	↘	-	-	-	-	-	↘	↗	↘	↗	↘	↗
	Practice	↗	-	↘	↗	↗	-	-	-	-	-	-	↘	-	-	-	↗	-
	Teach. Voc.	↗	↘	↘		↗	↘	↗		↗	↗	↗		-	-	-	↗	↗
	Listening	-	-	↘	-	↗		-	-	↗	-	↘	-	↘	↗	↗	↘	-
	Reading	↗	↗	↘	-	-		-	↗	↗	-	-	↘	↘	↗	↗	-	-
	Speaking	↘	-	↘	-	-		-	↘	-	-	-	↗	↘	↗	↗	-	-
	Writing	-	↘	↘	-	↗		-	-	↗	-	↗	↗	↘	↗	↗	↘	-
	Timetabling	↘	↗	↘	↗	-	-	↘	-	-	↗	-	-	-	↘	↘	↗	↗
	Using Pub. Mat.	↘	-	-	↗	↘	↗	-	-	↗	-	-	↗	-	-	-	↘	-
	Lesson Planning	↘	↗	↘	↗	-	-	-	↗	-	-	-	↘	-	-	-	↗	-
	Teach. Dif. Lev.	↘	-	-	↗	↘	↗	-	-	-	-	-	↗	-	↗	-	-	-
	Class. Manag.	↘	-	↘	-	-	↗		↗	↘	-	-	↗	↘	-	-	-	
Whole Course		↘	↗	↘	↗	↗	↘	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↘	↗	↗	↘	↗
Part I (A)		↘	↗	↘	↗	↗	↘	-	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↘	↗	↗	↘	↗
Part II (B/C)		↗	↗	-	↘	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	-	↗	↘	↗	↗	↘	↗	↗

APPENDIX 4

PERCEPTIONS OF THE TEACHERS

- A Completed Grid

- Table 4A - List of Constructs under Superordinate Categories

- Table 5 - Tutors' Allotment to Construct Poles

CENTRE FOR THE STUDY OF HUMAN LEARNING

COPYRIGHT 1973

PAIR	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	E6	E7	E8	E9	SINGLETON
C1 Ability to assimilate ideas quickly.	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	Slow to assimilate ideas. C1
C2 Aggressive	✓	X	X	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	Passive C2
C3 Sensitive of others' feelings.	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	Insensitive. C3
C4 Always pleasant / eager to help	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Unpleasant, unhelpful. C4
C5 Forceful / Aggressive	✓	X	X	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	Passive. C5
C6 Sure of themselves / confident	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Unsure / C6

Table 4A - List of Constructs under Superordinate Categories

1 - "SENSITIVE"	
2 - "LIVELY"	
3 - "CONSIDERATE"	in touch; thoughtful; concerned; aware; passive (aggressive)
4 - "HELPFUL"	supportive; approachable; attentive
5 - "OPEN MINDED"	innovative; practical approach; flexible; imaginative; diversity of interests; enthusiastic; thorough; willing to learn new ideas
6 - "EXTROVERT"	dynamic; outgoing; gregarious; forthcoming; outspoken; bossy
7 - "CONFIDENT"	self assured; self contained
8 - "STIMULATING"	interesting; enthusiastic
9 - "CREATIVE"	artistic
10 - "RELAXED"	calm; easy going; happy-go-lucky
11 - "CONVENTIONAL"	
12 - "SENSE OF HUMOUR"	witty
13 - "ORGANIZED"	ordered
14 - "PLEASANT"	charismatic; persuasive
15 - "LOGICAL THINKER"	sharp; clear thinker
16 - "CONSCIENTIOUS"	

Table 5 - Tutors' Allotment to Construct Poles

CONSTRUCTS	SUBJECTS																
	001	002	003	004	005	006	007	008	009	010	011	012	013	014	016	017	018
1-"SENSITIVE		B/C	B/C	B/C		B/C			B/C	B/C	B/C				B/C		A/C
2-"LIVELY"	A/B			A								A		B/C			
3-"CONSIDERATE"	B		B/C		B/C						B/C	B/C		B	B/C		A/C
4-"HELPFUL"					A/C			B/C	B/C	B/C			A	B			
5-"OPEN MINDED"						B/C	A/C	B/C	B/C		B/C					B/C	
6-"EXTROVERT"	A/B	A				A/B	A/B	A	A/B			B/C	A/C		B/C		
7-"CONFIDENT"					A/C	B/C	B/C										
8-"LOGICAL THINKER"																	
9-"SENSE OF HUMOUR"					A												
10-"STIMULATING"					B/C					B/C		B/C					
11-"CONVENTIONAL"							A/C							A			
12-"RELAXED"								B/C					C				
13-"CREATIVE"	A/B	B/C														B/C	
14-"PLEASANT"							A/C										
15-"ORGANIZED"	A/C																
16-"CONSCIENTIOUS"																	

Note: A, B and C refer to the tutors. When they appear in this table it means that that tutor A, B or C has been alloted to the pole of the construct on the table. By the same token when A, B or C do not appear together with the others it means s/he has been alloted to the other pole of the construct. When none of the tutors appear on the table it means that for this informant in relation to this construct the three tutors were not distinguished.

APPENDIX 5

SUBJECTS' PROFILES

Key

Questionnaires:

Pre E - "Pre-course"questionnaire score for "Enjoyment"

Post E - "Post-course" questionnaire score for "Enjoyment"

Pre D - "Pre-course" questionnaire score for "Difficulty"

Post D - "Post-course" questionnaire score for "Difficulty"

Pre U - "Pre-course" questionnaire score for "Usefulness"

Post U - "Post-course" questionnaire score for "Usefulness"

Var. - Variation ("post-course" score minus "pre-course" score)

Inc./Dec. - Increase/Decrease

↗ - positive variation

↘ - negative variation

\- - nil variation

A, B/C - Tutors

* - mean variation between "pre and post-course" scores

Grid

A, B/C - Tutors

Numbers and constructs refer to the superordinate categories (cf. table 4, page 31)

PROFILE

QUESTIONNAIRES

SUBJECT - 002

		Pre E	Post E	Var.	Inc/ Dec.	Pre D	Post D	Var.	Inc/ Dec.	Pre U	Post U	Var.	Inc/ Dec.
B/C	Lang. Anal.	6	7	+1	↗	4	5	+1	↗	7	7	-	-
	Pronunc.	2	7	+5	↗	2	6	+4	↗	4	7	+3	↗
A	Pres Lang Its	7	5	-2	↘	5	7	+2	↗	7	7	-	-
	Practice	5	6	+1	↗	6	7	+1	↗	7	7	-	-
	Teach. Voc.	7	5	-2	↘	6	6	-	-	7	6	-1	↘
	Listening	6	6	-	-	5	4	-1	↘	6	6	-	-
	Reading	5	4	-1	↘	5	5	-	-	5	6	+1	↗
	Speaking	7	6	-1	↘	6	7	+1	↗	7	7	-	-
	Writing	4	2	-2	↘	5	7	+2	↗	5	4	-1	↘
	Timetabling	3	5	+2	↗	4	6	+2	↗	4	6	+2	↗
	Using P. Mat.	4	6	+2	↗	4	4	-	-	4	4	-	-
	Lesson Plan.	6	6	-	-	6	6	-	-	6	7	+1	↗
	Teach Dif Lev	6	5	-1	↘	6	7	+1	↗	7	7	-	-
	Class. Man.	5	5	-	-	4	4	-	-	5	5	-	-
				*				*				*	
Whole Course				+0.1	↗			+0.9	↗			+0.3	↗
Part II (B/C)				+3	↗			+2.5	↗			+1.5	↗
Part I (A)				-0.3	↘			+0.6	↗			+0.1	↗

GRID:

	A	B/C
1	Not sensitive	Sensitive
6	Extrovert	Not extrovert
9	Not creative	Creative

PROFILE

QUESTIONNAIRES

SUBJECT - 003

		Pre E	Post E	Var.	Inc/ Dec.	Pre D	Post D	Var.	Inc/ Dec.	Pre U	Post U	Var.	Inc/ Dec.
B/C	Lang. Anal.	5	7	+2	↗	6	6	-	-	7	7	-	-
	Pronunc.	5	7	+2	↗	5	6	+1	↗	7	7	-	-
A	Pres Lang Its	6	6	-	-	5	5	-	-	7	6	-1	↘
	Practice	6	6	-	-	5	5	-	-	7	6	-1	↘
	Teach. Voc.	6	5	-1	↘	5	5	-	-	7	6	-1	↘
	Listening	5	5	-	-	5	5	-	-	7	6	-1	↘
	Reading	6	5	-1	↘	5	5	-	-	7	6	-1	↘
	Speaking	7	5	-2	↘	6	5	-1	↘	7	6	-1	↘
	Writing	6	5	-1	↘	5	5	-	-	7	6	-1	↘
	Timetabling	5	4	-1	↘	5	5	-	-	7	5	-2	↘
	Using P. Mat.	6	4	-2	↘	5	5	-	-	6	6	-	-
	Lesson Plan.	7	5	-1	↘	5	6	+1	↗	7	6	-1	↘
	Teach Dif Lev	6	6	-	-	6	6	-	-	7	7	-	-
	Class. Man.	6	5	-1	↘	4	5	+1	↗	7	6	-1	↘
				*				*				*	
Whole Course				-4.2	↘			+0.1	↗			-0.8	↘
Part II (B/C)				+2	↗			+0.5	↗			0	-
Part I (A)				-0.8	↘			+0.1	↗			-0.9	↘

GRID:

	A	B/C
1	Not sensitive	Sensitive
3	Not considerate	Considerate

PROFILE

QUESTIONNAIRES

SUBJECT - 004

		Pre E	Post E	Var.	Inc/ Dec.	Pre D	Post D	Var.	Inc/ Dec.	Pre U	Post U	Var.	Inc/ Dec.
B/C	Lang. Anal.	5	4	-1	↘	7	7	-	-	7	7	-	-
	Pronunc.	5	7	+2	↗	5	5	-		7	6	-1	
A	Pres Lang Its	6	7	+1	↗	5	6	+1	↗	6	7	+1	↗
	Practice	5	7	+2	↗	6	7	+1	↗	6	7	+1	↗
	Teach. Voc.	-	7			-	5			-	7		
	Listening	5	5	-	-	5	7	+2	↗	6	6	-	-
	Reading	5	4	-1	↘	4	6	+2	↗	6	6	-	-
	Speaking	7	7	-		4	5	+1	↗	7	7	-	-
	Writing	5	4	-1	↘	4	7	+3	↗	6	6	-	-
	Timetabling	4	2	-2	↘	5	7	+2	↗	6	7	+1	↗
	Using P. Mat.	5	4	-1	↘	4	7	+3	↗	6	7	+1	↗
	Lesson Plan.	5	2	-3	↘	4	7	+3	↗	6	7	+1	↗
	Teach Dif Lev	5	7	+2	↗	6	7	+1	↗	6	7	+1	↗
	Class. Man.	6	7	+1	↗	5	4	-1	↘	7	7	-	-
				*				*				*	
Whole Course				-0.1	↘			+1.4	↗			+0.4	↗
Part II (B/C)				+0.5	↗			0	-			-0.5	↘
Part I (A)				-0.2	↘			+1.6	↗			+0.5	↗

GRID:

	A	B
1	Not sensitive	Sensitive
2	Lively	Not lively

PROFILE

QUESTIONNAIRES

SUBJECT - 008

		Pre E	Post E	Var.	Inc/ Dec.	Pre D	Post D	Var.	Inc/ Dec.	Pre U	Post U	Var.	Inc/ Dec.
B/C	Lang. Anal.	2	5	+3	↗	6	6	-	-	6	7	+1	↗
	Pronunc.	4	4	-	-	4	5	+1	↗	5	6	+1	↗
A	Pres Lang Its	7	6	-1	↘	5	6	+1	↗	7	7	-	-
	Practice	6	6	-	-	5	6	+1	↗	6	6	-	-
	Teach. Voc.	6				4				7			
	Listening	5	5	-	-	6	4	-2	↘	7	7	-	-
	Reading	5	4	-1	↘	6	5	-1	↘	5	6	+1	↗
	Speaking	6	7	+1	↗	6	5	-1	↘	7	6	-1	↘
	Writing	5	4	-1	↘	6	5	-1	↘	5	5	-	-
	Timetabling	2	4	+2	↗	5	4	-1	↘	5	5	-	-
	Using P. Mat.	5	4	-1	↘	4	4	-	-	5	5	-	-
	Lesson Plan.	4	4	-	-	5	5	-	-	5	6	+1	↗
	Teach Dif Lev	6	5	-1	↘	6	6	-	-	7	7	-	-
	Class. Man.	5	5	-	-	5	6	+1	↗	6	7	+1	↗
				*				*				*	
Whole Course				+0.1	↗			-0.1	↘			+0.3	↗
Part II (B/C)				+1.5	↗			+0.5	↗			+1	↗
Part I (A)				-0.1	↘			-0.3	↘			+0.2	↗

GRID:

	A	B/C
4	Not approachable	Approachable
5	Not flexible	Flexible
6	Not extrovert	Extrovert
10	Not relaxed	Relaxed

PROFILE

QUESTIONNAIRES

SUBJECT - 010

		Pre E	Post E	Var.	Inc/ Dec.	Pre D	Post D	Var.	Inc/ Dec.	Pre U	Post U	Var.	Inc/ Dec.
B/C	Lang. Anal.	6	6	-	-	6	6	-	-	6	7	+1	↗
	Pronunc.	6	5	-1	↘	7	7	-	-	7	6	-1	↘
A	Pres Lang Its	6	6	-	-	7	7	-	-	7	7	-	-
	Practice	5	6	+1	↗	7	7	-	-	7	7	-	-
	Teach. Voc.	4	5	+1	↗	4	5	+1	↗	6	7	+1	↗
	Listening	5	6	+1	↗	7	6	-1	↘	7	7	-	-
	Reading	5	5	-	-	6	6	-	-	7	7	-	-
	Speaking	5	6	+1	↗	6	6	-	-	7	7	-	-
	Writing	5	6	+1	↗	6	6	-	-	7	7	-	-
	Timetabling	4	4	-	-	7	7	-	-	5	7	+2	↗
	Using P. Mat.	6	5	-1	↘	5	6	+1		7	7	-	-
	Lesson Plan.	5	4	-1	↘	6	7	+1		7	7	-	-
	Teach Dif Lev	6	6	-	-	5	6	+1	↗	7	7	-	-
	Class. Man.	7	6	-1	↘	6	6	-	-	7	7	-	-
				*				*				*	
Whole Course				+0.07	↗			+0.2	↗			+0.2	↗
Part II (B/C)				-0.5	↘			0	-			0	-
Part I (A)				+0.1	↗			+0.2	↗			+0.2	↗

GRID:

	A	B/C
1	Not sensitive	Sensitive
4	Not helpful	Helpful
8	Not enthusiastic	Enthusiastic

PROFILE

QUESTIONNAIRES

SUBJECT - 011

		Pre E	Post E	Var.	Inc/ Dec.	Pre D	Post D	Var.	Inc/ Dec.	Pre U	Post U	Var.	Inc/ Dec.
B/C	Lang. Anal.	3	7	+4	↗	6	5	-1	↘	6	7	+1	↗
	Pronunc.	6	7	+1	↗	5	5	-1	↘	6	7	+1	↗
A	Pres Lang Its	4	6	+2	↗	5	6	+1	↗	7	7	-	-
	Practice	7	7	-	-	5	5	-	-	7	7	-	-
	Teach. Voc.	3	6	+3	↗	2	5	+3	↗	6	7	+1	↗
	Listening	6	5	-1	↘	6	6	-	-	7	6	-1	↘
	Reading	5	6	+1	↗	7	4	-3	↘	6	6	-	-
	Speaking	5	6	+1	↗	7	5	-2	↘	7	7	-	-
	Writing	4	5	+1	↗	5	5	-	-	5	6	+1	↗
	Timetabling	3	4	+1	↗	4	4	-	-	6	6	-	-
	Using P. Mat.	6	5	-1	↘	4	5	-1	↘	6	6	-	-
	Lesson Plan.	4	5	+1	↗	6	6	-	-	7	7	-	-
	Teach Dif Lev	6	7	+1	↗	5	5	-	-	7	7	-	-
	Class. Man.	4	6	+2	↗	5	4	-1	↘	6	6	-	-
				*				*				*	
Whole Course				+1.1	↗			-0.3	↘			+0.2	↗
Part II (B/C)				+2.5	↗			-1	↘			+1	↗
Part I (A)				+0.9	↗			-0.2	↘			+0.1	↗

GRID:

	A	B/C
1	Not sensitive	Sensitive
3	Not thoughtful	Thoughtful
5	Not imaginative	Imaginative

PROFILE

QUESTIONNAIRES

SUBJECT - 012

		Pre E	Post E	Var.	Inc/ Dec.	Pre D	Post D	Var.	Inc/ Dec.	Pre U	Post U	Var.	Inc/ Dec.
B/C	Lang. Anal.	7	7	-	–	6	3	-3	↘	7	6	-1	↘
	Pronunc.	7	5	-2	↘	7	5	-2	↘	7	7	-	–
A	Pres Lang Its	6	5	-1	↘	7	6	-1	↘	7	6	-1	↘
	Practice	6	5	-1	↘	6	5	-1	↘	7	6	-1	↘
	Teach. Voc.	5				6				6			
	Listening	7	5	-2	↘	6	6	-	-	7	7	-	–
	Reading	6	6	-	–	6	5	-1	↘	7	6	-1	↘
	Speaking	7	7	-	–	7	5	-2	↘	6	7	+1	↗
	Writing	5	2	-3	↘	7	6	-1	↘	5	3	+2	↗
	Timetabling	1	3	+2	↗	7	7	-		7	7	-	–
	Using P. Mat.	3	5	+2	↗	6	5	-1	↘	5	6	+1	↗
	Lesson Plan.	6	5	-1	↘	7	7	-		7	6	-1	↘
	Teach Dif Lev	5	5	-	–	4	7	+3	↗	4	6	+2	↗
	Class. Man.	4	6	+2	↗	6	5	-1	↘	6	7	+1	↗
				*				*				*	
Whole Course				-0.3	↘			-0.7	↘			+0.1	↗
Part II (B/C)				-1.0	↘			-2.0	↘			-0.5	↘
Part I (A)				-0.2	↘			-0.4	↘			+0.2	↗

GRID:

	A	B/C
2	Not lively	Lively
3	Not concerned	Concerned
6	Not outgoing	Outgoing
8	Not interesting	Interesting

PROFILE

QUESTIONNAIRES

SUBJECT - 016

		Pre E	Post E	Var.	Inc/ Dec.	Pre D	Post D	Var.	Inc/ Dec.	Pre U	Post U	Var.	Inc/ Dec.
B/C	Lang. Anal.	4	5	+1	↗	6	5	+1	↗	7	7	-	-
	Pronunc.	5	5	-	-	1	5	+4	↗	7	6	-1	↘
A	Pres Lang Its	5	6	+1	↗	5	4	-1	↘	6	7	+1	↗
	Practice	6	7	+1	↗	5	4	-1	↘	7	7	-	-
	Teach. Voc.	4	7	+3	↗	5	5	-	-	7	7	-	-
	Listening	5	6	+1	↗	2	4	+2	↗	5	7	+2	↗
	Reading	7	7	-	-	3	4	+1	↗	6	7	+1	↗
	Speaking	5	7	+2	↗	3	4	+1	↗	6	7	+1	↗
	Writing	6	6	-	-	3	4	+1	↗	6	7	+1	↗
	Timetabling	5	4	-1	↘	5	4	-1		7	6	-1	↘
	Using P. Mat.	6	5	-1	↘	3	5	+2	↗	6	6	-	-
	Lesson Plan.	5	4	-1	↘	5	6	+1	↗	7	7	-	-
	Teach Dif Lev	5	5	-	-	5	6	+1	↗	7	7	-	-
	Class. Man.	6	7	+1	↗	6	4	-2	↘	7	7	-	-
				*				*				*	
Whole Course				+0.5	↗			+0.8	↗			+0.2	↗
Part II (B/C)				+0.5	↗			+3	↗			-0.5	↘
Part I (A)				+0.5	↗			+0.5	↗			+0.4	↗

GRID:

	A	B/C
1	Not sensitive	Sensitive
3	Not considerat	Considerate
6	Not extrovert	Extrovert

PROFILE

QUESTIONNAIRES

SUBJECT - 017

		Pre E	Post E	Var.	Inc/ Dec.	Pre D	Post D	Var.	Inc/ Dec.	Pre U	Post U	Var.	Inc/ Dec.
B/C	Lang. Anal.	5	7	+2	↗	6	5	-1	↘	7	7	-	-
	Pronunc.	6	7	+1	↗	3	5	+2	↗	6	7	+1	↗
A	Pres Lang Its	6	5	-1	↘	6	5	-1	↘	7	6	-1	↘
	Practice	6	6	-	-	5	5	-	-	6	7	+1	↗
	Teach. Voc.	5	6	+1	↗	5	5	-	-	7	6	-1	↘
	Listening	5	5	-	-	6	6	-	-	7	6	-1	↘
	Reading	5	5	-	-	6	4	-2	↘	6	6	-	-
	Speaking	6	6	-	-	6	5	-1	↘	7	7	-	-
	Writing	6	5	-1	↘	7	5	-2	↘	6	5	-1	↘
	Timetabling	4	5	+1	↗	6	5	-1	↘	5	6	+1	↗
	Using P. Mat.	5	4	-1	↘	4	5	+1	↗	6	5	-1	↘
	Lesson Plan.	4	6	+2	↗	6	4	-2	↘	7	6	-1	↘
	Teach Dif Lev	6	7	+1	↗	7	6	-1	↘	7	7	-	-
	Class. Man.	7	6	-1	↘	5	5	-	—	7	7	-	-
				*				*				*	
Whole Course				+0.2	↗			-0.5	↘			-0.2	↘
Part II (B/C)				+0.1	↗			-0.7	↘			-0.3	↘
Part I (A)				+1.5	↗			+0.5	↗			+0.5	↗

GRID:

	A	B/C
5	Not innovative	Innovative
9	Not creative	Creative